arXiv:1410.2782v3 [math.CA] 8 Mar 2016

SETS OF ABSOLUTE CONTINUITY FOR HARMONIC MEASURE IN NTA DOMAINS

JONAS AZZAM

ABSTRACT. We show that if Ω is an NTA domain with harmonic measure ω and $E \subseteq \partial\Omega$ is contained in an Ahlfors regular set, then $\omega|_E \ll \mathscr{H}^d|_E$. Moreover, this holds quantitatively in the sense that for all $\tau > 0$ ω obeys an A_∞-type condition with respect to $\mathscr{H}^d|_{E'}$, where $E' \subseteq E$ is so that $\omega(E\backslash E') < \tau\omega(E)$, even though $\partial\Omega$ may not even be locally $\mathscr{H}^d$-finite. We also show that, for uniform domains with uniform complements, if $E \subseteq \partial\Omega$ is the Lipschitz image of a subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, then there is $E' \subseteq E$ with $\mathscr{H}^d(E\backslash E') < \tau\mathscr{H}^d(E)$ upon which a similar A_∞-type condition holds.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Background 2
1.2. Main results 4
1.3. Outline 7
1.4. Acknowledgements 8
2. Notation, Preliminaries, and Harmonic Measure 8
3. "Cubes" and Carleson packing conditions on porosity 12
4. The sets $\Omega_E^{\pm}$ 17
5. The proof of Theorem 1.8 21
6. Proof of Theorem 1.10 28
7. Appendix 32
7.1. The proof of Lemma 4.2 32
7.2. Proof of Lemma 3.2 35
References 36

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 31A15,28A75,28A78.

Key words and phrases. Harmonic measure, absolute continuity, nontangentially accessible (NTA) domains, A_∞-weights, doubling measures, porosity.

The author was supported by grants ERC grant 320501 of the European Research Council (FP7/2007-2013) and NSF RTG grant 0838 212.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Background.** Given a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and $E \subseteq \partial\Omega$, when do we have $\omega \ll \mathscr{H}^d$ on E? In [27], Øksendal showed that harmonic measure on a simply connected planar domain Ω is absolutely continuous with respect to to $\mathscr{H}^1$ on E if it is contained in a line L. In [22], Kaufmann and Wu generalized this by showing L could replaced with a bi-Lipschitz curve, and Bishop and Jones in [9] showed absolute continuity occurred inside *any* Lipschitz curve. In dimensions larger than two, however, the obvious generalizations of these results are false: In [30], Wu gives an example of a domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that gives positive harmonic measure to a set of Hausdorff dimension 1 in $\mathbb{R}^2$. In spite of this, she proves an analogue of [22] under some mild geometric assumptions. The first involves the notion of uniformity.

Definition 1.1. We say that Ω is a *C-uniform domain* if, for every $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$ there is a path $\gamma \subseteq \Omega$ connecting x and y such that

(1) the length of γ is at most $C|x-y|$ and
(2) for $t \in \gamma$, $\operatorname{dist}(t, \partial\Omega) \geq \operatorname{dist}(t, \{x, y\})/C$.

Roughly speaking, this says that the domain Ω has no bottlenecks. The second condition is the following.

Definition 1.2. We say that Ω satisfies the *C-interior corkscrew condition* if for all $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ and $r \in (0, \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega)$ there is a ball $B(x, r/C) \subseteq \Omega \cap B(\xi, r)$. We say Ω satisfies the *C-exterior corkscrew condition* if there is a ball $B(y, r/C) \subseteq B(\xi, r)\backslash\Omega$ for all $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ and $r \in (0, \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega)$.

It is not hard to show that a C-uniform domain satisfies the interior corkscrew condition with constant depending on C.

We can now state the result from [30]. For a domain Ω, we will let ω^z_Ω denote harmonic measure evaluated at a point $z \in \Omega$.

Theorem 1.3. [30] *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be any domain satisfying the exterior corkscrew condition, and let Γ be a topological sphere such that $\Gamma^c = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$ where Ω_1 and Ω_2 are disjoint uniform domains for which $\omega^{z_i}_{\Omega_i} \ll \mathscr{H}^d|_\Gamma$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $z_i \in \Omega_i$. Then $\omega^z_\Omega|_{\Gamma\cap\partial\Omega} \ll \mathscr{H}^d|_{\Gamma\cap\partial\Omega}$ for $z \in \Omega$.*

Admissible surfaces Γ include, for example, bi-Lipschitz images of $\mathbb{S}^d$ (see [21, Theorem 10.1].

Under more stringent conditions on the geometry of Ω, one can glean more quantitative information about absolute continuity. The first condition is just the combination of the previous two conditions we've seen so far.

Definition 1.4. A *C-nontangentially accessible (or C-NTA) domain*[1] Ω is a C-uniform domain satisfying the C-exterior corkscrew condition.

These domains were introduced in [21] by Jerison and Kenig, and they have just enough geometry to guarantee harmonic measure enjoys some useful properties (see Theorem 2.5 below).

The next assumption is that $\partial\Omega$ is Ahlfors regular.

Definition 1.5. A metric space Z is *A-Ahlfors d-regular* if there is $A \geq 1$ so that

$$r^d/A \leq \mathscr{H}^d_Z(B_Z(x,r)) \leq Ar^d \text{ for all } x \in Z, 0 < r < \operatorname{diam} Z \qquad (1.1)$$

where $B_Z(x,r)$ and $\mathscr{H}^d_Z$ denote the open ball in Z of radius r centered at x and the Hausdorff measure on Z respectively.

In [13], David and Jerison showed that, under these assumptions, not only are ω and $\mathscr{H}^d$ mutually absolutely continuous, but quantitatively so, which we make precise in the next theorem.

Theorem 1.6. *For all $A, C > 1$, integers $d \geq 2$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, there are constants $C_{DJ} = C_{DJ}(A,C,d) > 0$ and $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, A, C, d) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a C-NTA domain with an A-Ahlfors d-regular boundary. Let $\xi_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $r_0 \in (0, \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega)$, $z_0 \in \Omega \backslash B(\xi_0, C_{DJ} r_0)$, and set $\omega = \omega^{z_0}_\Omega$. Then ω is A_∞-equivalent to $\mathscr{H}^d$ on $B_0 \cap \partial\Omega$, meaning whenever $F \subseteq B(\xi, r) \cap E$ with $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ and $B(\xi, r) \subseteq B(\xi_0, r_0)$, we have*[2]
(a) $\omega(F)/\omega(B(\xi,r)) < \delta$ implies $\mathscr{H}^d|_{\partial\Omega}(F)/\mathscr{H}^d|_{\partial\Omega}(B(\xi,r)) < \varepsilon$ and
(b) $\mathscr{H}^d|_{\partial\Omega}(F)/\mathscr{H}^d|_{\partial\Omega}(B(\xi,r)) < \delta$ implies $\omega(F)/\omega(B(\xi,r)) < \varepsilon$.
In particular, $\omega \ll \mathscr{H}^d \ll \omega$ on $\partial\Omega$.

This is an improvement over a result of Dahlberg who originally proved this for domains whose boundaries were locally Lipschitz graphs [11]. In [7], Badger showed one still has $\mathscr{H}^d \ll \omega$ if instead of (1.1) one only assumes $\mathscr{H}^d|_{\partial\Omega}$ is locally finite. He also conjectured that one should still have $\omega \ll \mathscr{H}^d$ in this scenario, but this is false by an example of the author, Mourgoglou, and Tolsa [4] (which is a refinement of an example of Wolff [29] that we will discuss below). In fact, locally, the domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ constructed in [4] satisfies, for some $A > 1 > \varepsilon > 0$, $A^{-1}r^d < \mathscr{H}^d(B(\xi,r) \cap \partial\Omega) < Ar^{d-\varepsilon}$ for $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ and $r > 0$ small; that is, (1.1) just barely fails for $\partial\Omega$.

[1] This is not the usual definition of NTA domains, but it is quantitatively equivalent. For example, see [2].

[2] In [13], they show that there exists a certain pair $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ so that these conditions hold, but since $\partial\Omega$ is Ahlfors regular, this stronger statement can be shown to hold by repeating the arguments in Chapter 5 of [28].

Finally, we mention some very recent results in the opposite direction, that is, results describing *necessary* conditions for absolute continuity. The domains considered by Dahlberg, David and Jerison, and Badger mentioned above all have boundaries that are d-*rectifiable*, meaning they may be exhausted up to a set of d-measure zero by d-dimensional Lipschitz graphs, and this is crucial in establishing absolute continuity. The first author, Hofmann, Martell, Mayboroda, Mourgoglou, Tolsa, and Volberg have shown that $\omega|_E \ll \mathscr{H}^d|_E$ in fact *implies* E is a d-rectifiable set plus a set of ω-measure zero, and this holds for *any* domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ for any $d \geq 1$ [5] (see also [26] for a quantitative version of this result). In particular, the result of Bishop and Jones in the plane can be improved: for $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ simply connected, $\omega|_E \ll \mathscr{H}^1|_E$ for some $E \subseteq \partial\Omega$ if and only if E may be covered up to ω-measure zero by Lipschitz curves.

Hofmann, Le, Martell, and Nyström have shown that if the Poisson kernel for harmonic measure of a uniform domain with d-regular boundary satisfies a type of weak-reverse-Hölder inequality, then this implies the boundary is *uniformly* rectifiable, and they even prove versions of this for p-harmonic measures (see [19]). See also [1] and [25].

1.2. **Main results.** Our results will require the notion of A_∞-equivalence on arbitrary sets that may not be Ahlfors regular.

Definition 1.7. For a Borel measure μ in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, we will say that μ *is* A_∞*-equivalent to* $\mathscr{H}^d$ *on* E if, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ so that, whenever $F \subseteq B(\xi, r) \cap E$ is a Borel set with $\xi \in E$ and $r > 0$,

(a) $\mu(F)/\mu(B(\xi, r)) < \delta$ implies $\mathscr{H}^d(F)/r^d < \varepsilon$ and
(b) $\mathscr{H}^d(F)/r^d < \delta$ implies $\mu(F)/\mu(B(\xi, r)) < \varepsilon$.

We'll say that μ is A_∞-equivalent to $\mathscr{H}^d$ *with data depending on* $t_1, ..., t_n$ if δ depends on these as well as ε.

Observe that if $E = \mathbb{R}^d$, this gives the usual definition of A_∞-equivalence.

Our first main result generalizes the works of David, Jerison, and Wu mentioned above for the case of NTA domains. Firstly, we remove the requirement that the portion of the boundary in question need be contained in a topological surface as in Wu's theorem. Secondly, we prove an A_∞ condition similar to David and Jerison's theorem but on a subset of the boundary contained in a locally d-regular set, rather than assuming that the whole boundary is d-regular.

Theorem 1.8. *Let* $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ *be a* C*-NTA domain. Let* $r_0 \in (0, \operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega)$, $\xi_0 \in \partial\Omega$, *and* $E \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap B(\xi_0, r_0)$ *be Borel with* $\omega(E)/\omega(B(\xi_0, r_0)) \geq \rho > 0$, *where* $\omega = \omega_\Omega^{z_0}$ *and* $B(z_0, r_0/C) \subseteq \Omega$. *Also suppose there is an*

L-bi-Lipschitz injection $g : E \to Z$ where Z is a metric space such that

$$r^d/A \leq \mathscr{H}^d(B_Z(x,r)) \leq Ar^d \text{ for all } x \in g(E), \quad r \in (0, r_0). \tag{1.2}$$

Here, B_Z is the metric ball in Z. Then for all $\tau > 0$ there is $E' \subseteq E$ compact and $C^{\pm}$-NTA domains $\Omega^{\pm}_{E'}$ with $C^{\pm} = C^{\pm}(C, d) > 0$, such that

(1) $\omega(E \backslash E') \leq \tau\omega(E)$,
(2) $\Omega^-_{E'} \subseteq \Omega \subseteq \Omega^+_{E'}$,
(3) $\Omega^-_{E'} \subseteq B(\xi_0, C^- r_0)$ *and* $\operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega^{\pm}_{E'} \geq r_0/C^-$,
(4) $\partial\Omega^{\pm}_{E'} \cap \partial\Omega = E'$,
(5) $\partial\Omega^{\pm}_{E'}$ *are* $A^{\pm}$*-Ahlfors regular with* $A^{\pm}$ *depending on* A, C, d, L, ρ *and* τ,
(6) ω *is* A_∞*-equivalent to* $\mathscr{H}^d$ *on* E' *with data depending on* A, C, d, L, ρ *and* τ*; in particular,* $\omega|_{E'} \ll \mathscr{H}^d|_{E'} \ll \omega|_{E'}$ *and* $\omega|_E \ll \mathscr{H}^d|_E$,
(7) there is $\delta_0 > 0$ *depending on* A, C, d, L, ρ *and* τ *so that* $\mathscr{H}^d(E) \geq \mathscr{H}^d(E') \geq \delta_0 r_0^d > 0$.



FIGURE 1. The shaded regions represent Ω, $\Omega^-_{E'} \subseteq \Omega$ and $\Omega^+_{E'} \supseteq \Omega$. Note that each $\Omega^{\pm}_{E'}$ traces out a portion of the set $E \subseteq \partial\Omega$.

See Figure 1. The condition about bi-Lipschitz embedability may seem odd, but one can think instead of Z as being an Ahlfors regular subset of $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ (in which case g is the identity and $L = 1$), or of E as a bi-Lipschitz image of a subset of $Z = \mathbb{R}^d$. Observe that we don't assume $\partial\Omega$ is Ahlfors regular or even locally d-finite as in Theorem 1.6. Moreover, we have no a priori assumptions on the set Z other than (1.2); in Theorem 1.3, for example, E is assumed to be in a topological surface Γ with various conditions, whereas our Z could be totally disconnected. The weak Ahlfors regularity assumption on Z should seem natural in light of the example in [4] mentioned earlier.

Recall that David and Jerison showed NTA domains with Ahlfors regular boundaries have (uniformly) rectifiable boundaries. Hence, the set E' in the lemma is also rectifiable. Moreover, the existence of the NTA domains $\Omega^{\pm}_{E'}$ gives us some quantitative information about the degree of rectifiability

of E: by specifying $\varepsilon > 0$, we can contain all but ε-percent of E inside a uniformly rectifiable set whose parameters are controlled by ε and the NTA constants of Ω. By an exhaustion argument, we have the following (more digestible) corollary.

Corollary 1.9. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and $E \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap Z$ where $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is a set of finite d-measure for which $0 < \liminf_{r\to 0} \mathscr{H}^d(B(\xi,r)\cap Z)/r^d \leq \limsup_{r\to 0} \mathscr{H}^d(B(\xi,r)\cap Z)/r^d < \infty$ for every $\xi \in E$ (for example, if Z is d-regular) and $\omega(E) > 0$. Then E contains a rectifiable subset E' of positive d-measure such that $\omega(E\backslash E') = 0$ and $\omega|_{E'} \ll \mathscr{H}^d|_{E'} \ll \omega|_{E'}$, so in particular, $\omega|_E \ll \mathscr{H}^d|_E$.*

The proof of Theorem 1.8 relies crucially on a simple lemma about the porosity of sets that have positive doubling measure, which may be of independent interest (for example, see [3] for a recent application). The statement requires the definition of dyadic cubes on metric spaces and some extra notation, so rather than stating it here, we strongly encourage the reader to glance at the statement below in Corollary 3.4 and the results in Section 3 in general.

Is there a scenario, or a theorem like Theorem 1.8, where the same results hold instead with the roles of $\mathscr{H}^d$ and ω reversed? That is, if $\mathscr{H}^d(E) > 0$, is there a subset of large $\mathscr{H}^d$-measure upon which ω and $\mathscr{H}^d$ are A_∞-equivalent? Without some further restrictions the answer is a definitive no. If we set

$$\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+ \backslash \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{i,j\in\mathbb{Z}} B(i2^{-n}e_1 + j2^{-n}e_2 + 2^{-n}e_3, 2^{-n-10}) \tag{1.3}$$

then Ω is NTA but $\omega(\mathbb{R}^2) = 0$. This is why we can't get $\mathscr{H}^d|_E \ll \omega|_E$ in Theorem 1.8: we know that we can exhaust almost all of E with respect to *harmonic measure*, but a large d-*measure* portion of E could be hiding somewhere. If we assume Ω has *uniform complement* as well as uniform interior (or *doubly uniform*), this in some sense gives E less places to hide and rules out that example. Unfortunately, this is still not enough: In [23], building off of Wolff's original work in [29], Lewis, Verchota, and Vogel construct examples of NTA domains $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $d \geq 2$, for which there is $F \subseteq \partial\Omega$ with $\omega(F^c) = 0$ and $\dim F < d$. Since $\dim \partial\Omega \geq d$, by Frostmann's lemma, we can find a set $G \subseteq \partial\Omega$ of finite and positive d-measure, and $E := G\backslash F$ is also a set of finite and positive d-measure for which $\omega(E) = 0$. If we assume E is rectifiable, it turns out this is enough to get an analogue of Theorem 1.8.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a C-uniform domain so that $(\Omega^c)^\circ$ is also C-uniform. Let $E \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap B(\xi_0, r_0)$ where E is the L-Lipschitz image of a Borel subset of $[0, r_0]^d$ such that $\mathscr{H}^d_\infty(E)/r_0^d \geq \rho > 0$. Then for all $\eta > 0$ there is $E' \subseteq E$ such that, for $B(z_0, r_0/C) \subseteq \Omega$,*

(1) $\mathscr{H}^d_\infty(E \backslash E') < \eta \mathscr{H}^d_\infty(E)$,
(2) $\omega^{z_0}_\Omega$ is A_∞-equivalent to $\mathscr{H}^d$ on E', with constants depending on C, d, η, L and ρ,
(3) $\omega^{z_0}_\Omega(E) \geq \delta > 0$ for some δ depending on C, d, η, L and ρ.

(See the next section for the definition of $\mathscr{H}^d_\infty$.) This theorem will follow from the more general Theorem 6.4 below whose statement requires the definition of uniform rectifiability; we will review this in Section 6. As a corollary, we get a qualitative version of Theorem 1.10.

Theorem 1.11. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a uniform domain with uniform complement and $\omega = \omega^{z_0}_\Omega$ be harmonic measure on Ω for some $z_0 \in \Omega$. If $E \subseteq \partial\Omega$ is a d-rectifiable set with $0 < \mathscr{H}^d(E) < \infty$, then $\omega \ll \mathscr{H}^d \ll \omega$ on $E \backslash S$ where $\mathscr{H}^d(S) = 0$; in particular, $\omega(E) > 0$.*

The example in [4] also happens to be doubly uniform, and thus the set S could very well have positive harmonic measure.

1.3. **Outline.** In Section 2, we go over some notation and some basic preliminary tools. In Section 3 we introduce some results about porosity and doubling measures that we will need later on for the special case of harmonic measures. In Section 4, we review and prove some general methods for constructing NTA domains containing a given NTA domain Ω whose boundaries have prescribed intersections with $\partial\Omega$, and under what conditions do they have Ahlfors regular boundaries.

In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.8, which follows a similar scheme as the proof of Theorem 1.6 by David and Jerison. They first showed that, in each ball centered on the boundary of Ω, one can trace out a large portion of $\partial\Omega$ by the boundary of a Lipschitz domain (that is, domains whose boundaries are locally L-Lipschitz graphs and Alhfors regular boundary), see [13, Theorem 1]). This is so that they can use Dahlberg's theorem [11], which says that L-Lipschitz domains have harmonic measure A_∞-equivalent to Hausdorff measure. Knowing this allows them to prove the same property for harmonic measure on Ω via the maximum principle. In our setting, the domains $\Omega^\pm_{E'}$ will play the role of their Lipschitz domains, and we use Theorem 1.6 instead of Dahlberg's theorem to say harmonic measure is A_∞-equivalent to $\mathscr{H}^d$ on these subdomains, after which we repeat the maximum principle argument in [13] (see Lemma 2.6 below). Hence, the bulk of this section is dedicated to showing how to use the results of Sections 3 and 4 to build the necessary domains $\partial\Omega^\pm_E$.

We don't know whether one can just assume that Ω satisfies the interior corkscrew condition (recall that some extra topological condition on Ω is necessary by Wu's example). The NTA assumption is mostly to guarantee that the harmonic measure has some doubling properties (which is used in a critical way) and it helps us construct the Ahlfors regular NTA domains $\Omega^{\pm}_{E'}$ so we can apply Theorem 1.6 to them. For further discussion on this, see Remark 3.6.

In Section 6, we use the lemmas from Section 4 and some results from the theory of uniform rectifiability to prove Theorem 1.10.

1.4. **Acknowledgements.** The author would like to thank John Garnett, Mihalis Mourgoglou, Raanan Schul, and Xavier Tolsa for their very helpful discussions and comments on an early draft, Albert Clop for identifying a mistake, Matthew Badger for pointing out some useful references, and the anonymous referee for his/her critique of the paper.

2. Notation, Preliminaries, and Harmonic Measure

We will write $a \lesssim b$ if there is $C > 0$ so that $a \leq Cb$ and $a \lesssim_t b$ if the constant C depends on the parameter t. We write $a \sim b$ to mean $a \lesssim b \lesssim a$ and define $a \sim_t b$ similarly.

In a metric space Z, we will denote the distance between points $x, y \in Z$ as $|x - y|$. For sets $A, B \subseteq Z$, we let

$$\operatorname{dist}(A, B) = \inf\{|x - y| : x \in A, y \in B\}, \quad \operatorname{dist}(x, A) = \operatorname{dist}(\{x\}, A),$$

and

$$\operatorname{diam} A = \sup\{|x - y| : x, y \in A\}.$$

Set for a set $A \subseteq Z$, let w_d be the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and define

$$\mathscr{H}^d_\delta(A) = w_d \inf\left\{\sum r_i^d : A \subseteq \bigcup B(x_i, r_i), x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d\right\}.$$

where ω_d is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We define the *d-dimensional Hausdorff measure* as

$$\mathscr{H}^d(A) = \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \mathscr{H}^d_\delta(A)$$

and the *d-dimensional Hausdorff content* as $\mathscr{H}^d_\infty(A)$. See [24, Chapter 4] for more details.

We will let $B(x, r)$will not denote the open ball of radius r centered at x. In this paper, we will be working in either $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, or a metric space Z, and we won't distinguish our notation for $|x - y|$ or $B(x, r)$ in these cases when it is clear from the context what we mean; otherwise, we will let $B_Z(x, r)$ denote the ball in Z and $\mathscr{H}^d_Z$ Hausdorff measure on Z. Also define $\lambda B(x, r) = B(x, \lambda r)$ and $\mathbb{1}_A$ to be the function identically one on A

and zero elsewhere.

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, a *d-dimensional dyadic cube Q of side length* 2^n in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a d-fold Cartesian product of closed intervals of the form $[i2^n, (i+1)2^n]$, where $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and we will denote the side length by $\ell(Q) = 2^n$. We will write λQ for the cube of the same center as Q and edges parallel to the coordinate axes but side length $\lambda\ell(Q)$.

Definition 2.1 (Whitney Cubes)**.** For an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and $K > 1$, we will denote by $\mathscr{W}_K(\Omega)$ the set of maximal dyadic cubes $Q \subseteq \Omega$ such that $KQ \cap \Omega^c = \emptyset$. These cubes have disjoint interiors and can be easily shown to satisfy the following properties:

(1) $\frac{K-1}{2}\ell(Q) \leq \operatorname{dist}(x, \Omega^c) \leq (1+K)\operatorname{diam} Q$ for all $x \in Q$,
(2) $(\frac{K-1}{2} - \sqrt{d+1}\frac{\lambda-1}{2})\ell(Q) \leq \operatorname{dist}(x, \Omega^c) \leq (1+K+(\lambda-1)/2)\operatorname{diam} Q$ for all $x \in \lambda Q$ if $\lambda \in [1, K)$ is close enough to 1 (depending on d and K)
(3) If $Q, R \in \mathscr{W}_K(\Omega)$ intersect, then $\ell(Q) \sim_{K,d} \ell(R)$.
(4) $\sum_{Q \in \mathscr{W}_k(\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\lambda Q} \lesssim_{K,d} \mathbb{1}_\Omega$ for $\lambda \in (1, K)$

We will just write $\mathscr{W}_3(\Omega)$ as $\mathscr{W}(\Omega)$.

We will say $Q, R \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)$ are *adjacent* if $Q \cap R \neq \emptyset$ and write $Q \sim R$. Also, let $P_{Q,R}$ denote the shortest path $Q = Q_0, ..., Q_n = R$ of Whitney cubes such that $Q_j \sim Q_{j+1}$ for $j = 0, ..., n-1$ and define $d_\Omega(Q, R) = n+1$. With the definition of Whitney cubes and this notation, we can now state an equivalent characterization of C-uniformity that we will need later.

Theorem 2.2 (Alternate characterization of uniform domains)**.** *A domain Ω is uniform if and only if it satisfies the interior corkscrew condition and there is $N_\Omega : [0, \infty) \circlearrowleft$ increasing such that,*

$$d_\Omega(Q, R) \leq N_\Omega(\operatorname{dist}(Q, R)/\min\{\ell(Q), \ell(R)\}) \text{ for all } Q, R \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega). \tag{2.1}$$

Remark 2.3. There are a few papers all giving different yet equivalent definitions of uniform domains. A proof of Theorem 2.2 is given in [2]; there they instead work with the so-called *Harnack chain condition*, which is quantitatively equivalent to the characterization in the above theorem.

Remark 2.4. As mentioned in the introduction, a C-uniform domain Ω automatically satisfies the interior corkscrew condition, with constant depending on C. For the sake of cleanliness, we will assume that all C-NTA domains also satisfy the exterior and interior corkscrew conditions *with the same constant C* (which can be arranged by increasing the value C depending only on some universal constant).

Bounded NTA domains Ω are regular in the sense of Wiener, so given a continuous f on $\partial\Omega$, one can use the Perron method to find u_f harmonic, continuous up to the boundary, and equal to f on the boundary as in [16, Section 2.8]. Then, given $z \in \Omega$, one defines harmonic measure via the Riesz representation theorem as the Radon measure w^z_Ω so that $\int_\Omega f dw^z = u_f(z)$. For unbounded NTA domains, the situation is more complicated, but given a bounded continuous f on $\partial\Omega$ we can still find a bounded harmonic u_f continuous up to $\partial\Omega$ and equal to f there, and thus we can define harmonic measure the same way; we refer the reader to [17, Chapter 5], particularly pages 206-7, Theorem 5.4.2, and page 217.

We recall a few basic results from [21][3]:

Theorem 2.5 (Local properties of harmonic heasure)**.** *Let Ω be a C-NTA domain, $\omega^{z_0}_\Omega$ be harmonic measure evaluated at $z_0 \in \Omega$, $\xi \in \partial\Omega$, $r \in (0, \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega)$, and let $E \subseteq B(\xi, r) \cap \partial\Omega$ be Borel.*

(1) [21, Lemma 4.11] *If $B(z, r/C) \subseteq \Omega \cap B(\xi, r)$ and $z_0 \in \Omega\backslash B(\xi, 2r)$, then*

$$w^{z_0}_\Omega(E)/w^{z_0}_\Omega(B(\xi, r)) \sim_{C,d} w^z_\Omega(E). \tag{2.2}$$

(2) [21, Lemma 4.2] *If $B(z, r/C) \subseteq \Omega \cap B(\xi, r)$, then*

$$w^z_\Omega(B(\xi, r)) \gtrsim_{C,d} 1. \tag{2.3}$$

(3) (Harnack's inequality) If $x \in Q \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)$ and $y \in R \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)$ and $\operatorname{dist}(Q, R)/\min\{\ell(Q), \ell(R)\} \leq \Lambda$, then for any Borel set $A \subseteq \partial\Omega$,

$$w^x_\Omega(A) \lesssim_{C,d,\Lambda} w^y_\Omega(A). \tag{2.4}$$

(4) (Local doubling property, [21, Lemma 4.9]*) If $z_0 \in \Omega\backslash B(\xi_0, 2r_0)$ for some $\xi_0 \in \partial\Omega$ or $B(z_0, r_0/C) \subseteq \Omega$, then for all $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ and $r > 0$ with $B(\xi, 2r) \subseteq B(\xi_0, r_0)$, we have*

$$\omega^{z_0}_\Omega(B(\xi, 2r)) \lesssim_{C,d,M_0} \omega^{z_0}_\Omega(B(\xi, r)). \tag{2.5}$$

As originally stated in [21], the constant in (2.5) is also allowed to depend on z_0, but an inspection of the proof shows that, so long as $z_0 \in \Omega\backslash B(\xi_0, 2r_0)$, this inequality holds independent of z_0, and this implies the case of $B(z_0, r_0/C) \subseteq \Omega$ by Harnack's inequality.

We now have enough tools to demonstrate the role the approach regions $\Omega^\pm_E$. Again, this type of argument appears in many sources and is rooted in complex analysis and the study of nontangential limits of harmonic functions, as well as the study of harmonic measure in NTA domains, so the

[3]Note that in [21], they assume their NTA domains are bounded domains, but this is only so that they can guarantee the existence of harmonic measure. Now that we know existence also holds for unbounded domains, the results carry over to this setting with identical proofs.

lemma below should be considered review. For a survey of this history, see the introduction to [21].

Lemma 2.6. *Let Ω be a C-NTA domain and $\omega = \omega_\Omega^{z_0}$ where $B(z_0, r_0/C) \subseteq \Omega$ for some $r_0 \in (0, \operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega)$. Suppose $E \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap B(\xi_0, r_0)$ for some $\xi_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and there are domains $\Omega_E^\pm$ so that*

(1) $\Omega_E^- \subseteq \Omega \subseteq \Omega_E^+$,
(2) $\partial\Omega_E^\pm \cap \partial\Omega \supseteq E$,
(3) $\operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega_E^\pm \geq r_0/C^-$,
(4) $\partial\Omega_E^\pm$ is $A^\pm$-Ahlfors regular.

Then ω is A_∞-equvalent to $\mathscr{H}^d$ on E.

Proof. Let E, $\Omega_E^\pm$, $\xi \in E$ and $r > 0$, and set $B = B(\xi, r)$. By a covering argument, since $E \subseteq B(\xi_0, r_0)$, we can assume without loss of generality that $r < qr_0$ where $q > 0$ will be determined later. Let $B(z, r_0/(C^-)^2) \subseteq B(\xi, r_0/C^-) \cap \Omega_E^-$, which exists by the corkscrew condition for Ω_E^-. Then $\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Omega_E^-) \geq r_0/(C^-)^2$, so if $q^{-1} > 2C_{DJ}(C^-)^2$, then $r < qr_0$ implies $z \notin B(\xi, C_{DJ}r)$. By Theorem 1.6, we know that $\omega^z_{\Omega_E^-}$ is A_∞-equivalent to $\mathscr{H}^d$ on $B \cap \partial\Omega_E^-$, meaning for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_- = \delta_-(\varepsilon, C^-, d, A^-)$ so that if $F \subseteq B \cap E$, then

(a) $\omega^z_{\Omega_E^-}(F) < \delta_- \omega^z_{\Omega_E^-}(B)$ implies $\mathscr{H}^d(F) < \varepsilon \mathscr{H}^d(B \cap \partial\Omega_E^-)$ and
(b) $\mathscr{H}^d(F) < \delta \mathscr{H}^d(B \cap \partial\Omega_E^-)$ implies $\omega^z_{\Omega_E^-}(F) < \varepsilon \omega^z_{\Omega_E^-}(B)$.

Let $\varepsilon, \varepsilon', \delta > 0$, and $F \subseteq E \cap B$ where $B = B(\xi, r)$ with $\xi \in E$ and $r < qr_0$ (where ε', δ and q will be determined later), and assume $\omega(F) < \delta\omega(B)$. Set $\delta' = \delta_-(\varepsilon', C^-, d, A^-)$. Pick $B(z', r/C^-) \subseteq B \cap \Omega_E^-$. For $q^{-1} < 2C$, since $B(z_0, r_0/C) \subseteq \Omega$,

$$|z_0 - \xi| \geq r_0/C > 2r$$

and we have $|z - \xi| \geq C_{DJ}r > 2r$ as well, so that we can apply Theorem 2.5 twice along with the maximum principle to obtain

$$\frac{\omega^z_{\Omega_E^-}(F)}{\omega^z_{\Omega_E^-}(B)} \sim_{C^-} \omega^{z'}_{\Omega_E^-}(F) \leq \omega^{z'}_\Omega(F) \sim_C \frac{\omega(F)}{\omega(B)} < \delta.$$

Thus, for δ small enough, we have $\omega^z_{\Omega_E^-}(F) < \delta' \omega^z_{\Omega_E^-}(B)$, which implies $\mathscr{H}^d(F) < \varepsilon' \mathscr{H}^d(B \cap \partial\Omega_E^-) \leq A^- \varepsilon' r^d$, and for ε' small enough, this implies $\mathscr{H}^d(F) < \varepsilon r^d$.

Conversely, let $\varepsilon, \varepsilon', \delta > 0$ (the latter two will be decided soon) and $F \subseteq E \cap B$ with $\mathscr{H}^d(F) < \delta r^d$, were we will decide δ in a moment. Let $B(z, r/(C^+)^2) \subseteq B(\xi, r/C^+) \cap \Omega_E^+$. Again, $q^{-1} > 2C_{DJ}(C^+)^{-2}$ implies $z \notin B(\xi, C_{DJ}r)$. Let $\varepsilon' > 0$ and pick δ' so that our A_∞ condition on $\omega^z_{\Omega^+}$ holds for ε' and δ' on $B \cap \partial\Omega_E^+$. Then $\mathscr{H}^d(F) < \delta r^d \leq A^+ \delta \mathscr{H}^d(B \cap \partial\Omega_E^+)$,

and so for δ small enough, $\mathscr{H}^d(F) < \delta' \mathscr{H}^d(B \cap \partial\Omega_E^+)$. Again by the maximum principle, the A_∞ condition, and Theorem 2.5,

$$\frac{\omega(F)}{\omega(B)} \sim_C \omega_\Omega^z(F) \leq \omega_{\Omega_E^+}^z(F) < \varepsilon' \omega_{\Omega_E^+}^z(B) < \varepsilon'$$

Picking ε' small enough guarantees $\omega(F)/\omega(B) < \varepsilon$.

□

3. "CUBES" AND CARLESON PACKING CONDITIONS ON POROSITY

In this section, we will review and develop some tools that will help us find the desired set E' in Theorem 1.8. The material for this section holds in more generality than just harmonic measure on NTA domains, but for doubling measures on metric measure spaces (if it bugs the reader, s/he can imagine all the measures below are just harmonic measure). We start by introducing the notion of "dyadic cubes" for a metric space. We'll use the construction of Hytönen and Martikainen from [20], which refines the originals of Christ [10] and David [12]. We will abuse notation by letting $|x-y|$ denote the metric distance between points x and y and $B(x,r)$ again denote the ball centered at x of radius r in the given space.

Theorem 3.1. *For $c_0 < 1/1000$, the following holds. Let $c_1 = 1/500$ and Σ be a metric space. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ there is a collection $\mathscr{D}_n$ of "cubes," which are Borel subsets of Σ such that*

(1) $\Sigma = \bigcup_{\Delta \in \mathscr{D}_n} \Delta$ for every n,
(2) if $\Delta, \Delta' \in \mathscr{D} = \bigcup \mathscr{D}_n$ and $\Delta \cap \Delta' \neq \emptyset$, then $\Delta \subseteq \Delta'$ or $\Delta' \subseteq \Delta$,
(3) for $\Delta \in \mathscr{D}_n$, there is $\zeta_\Delta \in X_n$ so that if $B_\Delta = B(\zeta_\Delta, 5c_0^n)$, then

$$c_1 B_\Delta \subseteq \Delta \subseteq B_\Delta.$$

For $\Delta \in \mathscr{D}_n$, define $\ell(\Delta) = 5c_0^n$, so that $B_\Delta = B(\zeta_\Delta, \ell(\Delta))$. Note that for $\Delta \in \mathscr{D}_n$ and $\Delta' \in \mathscr{D}_m$, we have $\ell(\Delta)/\ell(\Delta') = c_0^{n-m}$.

For $\lambda \leq 1$, define

$$\lambda\Delta = \{\xi \in \Delta : \operatorname{dist}(\xi, \Sigma \backslash \Delta) > (1-\lambda)\ell(\Delta)\}.$$

Let μ be a doubling measure on a metric space Σ, meaning $\mu(B(\xi, 2r)) \leq C_\mu \mu(B(\xi, r))$ for all $\xi \in \Sigma$ and $r > 0$. If $E \subseteq \Sigma$ is a δ-porous set (meaning for every $\xi \in E$ and $r > 0$ there is $B(\xi', \delta r) \subseteq (\Sigma \backslash E) \cap B(\xi, r)$), then $\mu(E) = 0$. This follows from the fact that the Lebesgue differentiation theorem still holds for doubling measures, and δ-porosity implies $\mu(E \cap B(\xi, r))/\mu(B(\xi, r)) \leq 1 - C_{\delta,\mu} < 1$ for all $\xi \in E$ and $r > 0$. Thus, a set of positive measure can't be porous inside every ball centered on E. In this section, we will quantify how many cubes Δ there are inside a given cube Δ_0 for which a set E is too porous near Δ, and we will give this control

in terms of a so-called *Carleson packing condition*. We will then use this condition to trim down the set E to a slightly smaller set E' such that every point in E' is contained in at most a bounded number of cubes that are porous for E.

However, we need to be even more careful for our applications later: $\omega_\Omega^{z_0}$ is globally doubling *with doubling constant depending on* z_0, and we'd like the constants in our results not to have this dependence. By (2.5), however, we can guarantee that $\omega_\Omega^{z_0}$ is doubling locally with constant independent of z_0 so long as z_0 avoids that portion of the boundary. Our next lemma, for example, is well known for the case of doubling measures, but we need to alter it a bit to account for the local doubling case.

Lemma 3.2. *Let Σ be a metric space and $\mathscr{D}_n$ the "cubes" constructed in Theorem 3.1. Let $c_0 < c_1/4$ and μ be measure on Σ such that, for some $\Delta_0 \in \mathscr{D}$, $\mu(B(\xi, 2r)) \leq C_\mu \mu(B(\xi, r))$ for $\xi \in 4B_{\Delta_0}$ and $0 < r \leq \ell(\Delta_0)$. There are $t_0, \alpha > 0$ (depending on C_μ) such that for $t \in (0,1)$ and $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_0$, $\mu(\Delta \backslash (1-t)\Delta) \leq t_0 t^\alpha \mu(\Delta)$ for some $\alpha > 0$.*

Note that C_μ is not necessarily the doubling constant of μ, only for those particular values of ξ and r in the lemma. This lemma can be obtained by carefully reading the proof in [10], but we will provide a proof for the reader's convenience in the appendix.

We now give our first lemma that helps quantify how porous a set can be.

Lemma 3.3. *Let μ be a Borel measure, $\mathscr{D}$ the cubes for $\Sigma = \operatorname{supp} \mu$ with constant c_0 and c_1, and $E \subseteq \Delta_0 \in \mathscr{D}$ be Borel. Let $M_0 > 1$ and suppose μ has the property that, for all $\xi \in 4M_0 B_{\Delta_0}$ and $r \in (0, 4M_0 \ell(\Delta_0))$, $\mu(B(\xi, 2r)) \leq C_\mu \mu(B(\xi, r))$ for some $C_\mu > 1$. Let $M < M_0$ and $\mathscr{W}(E^c)$ denote the maximal cubes $\Delta \in \mathscr{D}$ such that $MB_\Delta \cap E = \emptyset$. For $\beta > 0$, set*

$$\lambda_{M,\beta}(\Delta) = \sum_{\substack{\Delta' \in \mathscr{W}(E^c) \\ \Delta' \subseteq MB_\Delta}} \left(\frac{\ell(\Delta')}{\ell(\Delta)} \right)^\beta. \tag{3.1}$$

We set $\lambda_{M,\beta}(\Delta) = 0$ if it is an empty sum. If $\beta > \beta_0 := \log_2 C_\mu$, then for all $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_0$,

$$\sum_{\substack{\Delta \subseteq \Delta_1 \\ \Delta \cap E \neq \emptyset}} \lambda_{M,\beta}(\Delta) \mu(\Delta) \lesssim_{\mu, M, c_0, c_1, \beta} \mu(\Delta_1). \tag{3.2}$$

To avoid some double subscripts, we write $\lesssim_\mu$ to mean that the implied constant depends on the doubling constant C_μ.

Proof. **Claim:** When $\Delta' \subseteq MB_\Delta$ and $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_0$,

$$(\ell(\Delta')/\ell(\Delta))^{\beta_0} \lesssim_{M,C_\mu} \mu(\Delta')/\mu(\Delta). \tag{3.3}$$

Let $\Delta' \subseteq MB_\Delta$ and let N be such that

$$2^N c_1 \ell(\Delta') > 2M\ell(\Delta) \geq 2^{N-1} c_1 \ell(\Delta'). \tag{3.4}$$

Then $2^N c_1 B_{\Delta'} \supseteq MB_\Delta$, and $2^N < \frac{4M\ell(\Delta)}{c_1\ell(\Delta')}$, so that

$$N < \log_2 \left(\frac{4M\ell(\Delta)}{c_1\ell(\Delta')} \right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Delta') &\geq \mu(c_1 B_{\Delta'}) \geq C_\mu^{-N} \mu(2^N c_1 B_{\Delta'}) \geq C_\mu^{-N} \mu(MB_\Delta) \\ &\geq C_\mu^{\log_2 \frac{c_1}{4M}} \left(\frac{\ell(\Delta')}{\ell(\Delta)} \right)^{\log_2 C_\mu} \mu(\Delta). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. From now on, we write $\lambda = \lambda_{M,\beta}$ with $\beta > \beta_0$.

For fixed $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_0$, $\Delta' \subseteq MB_{\Delta_1}$ and $\Delta' \in \mathscr{W}(E^c)$, set

$$\mathscr{M}_n(\Delta') = \{\Delta \in \mathscr{D}_n : \Delta \subseteq \Delta_1, \Delta \cap E \neq \emptyset, \Delta' \subseteq MB_\Delta\}.$$

We prove here a few properties of this set:

(†) If $\Delta \in \mathscr{M}_n(\Delta')$, then $\ell(\Delta') \leq \ell(\Delta)$, and in particular, $\mathscr{M}_n(\Delta') \neq \emptyset$ only when $5c_0^n \geq \ell(\Delta')$.

To see this, note that since $\Delta' \in \mathscr{W}(E^c)$, $\Delta \cap E \neq \emptyset$, and $\Delta' \subseteq MB_\Delta$, if $\xi \in \Delta \cap E$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M\ell(\Delta') - \ell(\Delta) &\leq \operatorname{dist}(\zeta_{\Delta'}, E) - \ell(\Delta) \leq |\zeta_{\Delta'} - \xi| - \ell(\Delta)| \\ &\leq |\zeta_{\Delta'} - \xi| - |\xi - \zeta_\Delta| \leq |\zeta_{\Delta'} - \zeta_\Delta| \leq M\ell(\Delta) \end{aligned}$$

so $\ell(\Delta') \leq \frac{M+1}{M}\ell(\Delta) < 2\ell(\Delta)$, and since $\ell(\Delta')/\ell(\Delta)$ is a power of $c_0 < 1/1000$, we must have $\ell(\Delta') \leq \ell(\Delta)$.

(‡) The above estimate also implies $\zeta_\Delta \in B(\zeta_{\Delta'}, M\ell(\Delta)) = B(\zeta_{\Delta'}, 5Mc_0^n)$, and so the collection $\{c_1 B_\Delta : \Delta \in \mathscr{M}_n(\Delta')\}$ form a disjoint family of balls of radii $5c_0^n$ contained in $B(\zeta_{\Delta'}, 5(M+1)c_0^n)$. Moreover, using the doubling property of μ, and since $\ell(\Delta) = 5c_0^n$,

$$\mu(c_1 B_\Delta) \gtrsim_{\mu,M,c_1,c_0} \mu(4MB_\Delta) \geq \mu(B(\zeta_{\Delta'}, 5(M+1)c_0^n)),$$

and thus we know that

$$\begin{aligned} &\#\mathscr{M}_n(\Delta')\mu(B(\zeta_{\Delta'}, 5(M+1)c_0^n)) \\ &\qquad \lesssim_{M,c_1,c_0,\mu} \sum_{\Delta \in \mathscr{M}_n(\Delta')} \mu(c_1 B_\Delta) \leq \mu(B(\zeta_{\Delta'}, 5(M+1)c_0^n)) \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\#\mathscr{M}_n(\Delta') \lesssim_{\mu,M,c_1,c_0} 1. \tag{3.5}$$

Hence, for $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_0$, and $\beta > \beta_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{\Delta\subseteq\Delta_1\\ \Delta\cap E\neq\emptyset}} \lambda(\Delta)\mu(\Delta) &\overset{(3.3)}{\lesssim}_{\mu,M,\beta} \sum_{\substack{\Delta\subseteq\Delta_1\\ \Delta\cap E\neq\emptyset}} \sum_{\substack{\Delta'\subseteq MB_\Delta\\ \Delta'\in\mathscr{W}(E^c)}} \frac{\mu(\Delta')}{\mu(\Delta)}\left(\frac{\ell(\Delta')}{\ell(\Delta)}\right)^{\beta-\beta_0}\mu(\Delta)\\
&= \sum_{\substack{\Delta'\in\mathscr{W}(E^c)\\ \Delta'\subseteq MB_{\Delta_1}}} \mu(\Delta') \sum_{\substack{\Delta'\subseteq MB_\Delta, \Delta\cap E\neq\emptyset\\ \Delta\subseteq\Delta_1}} \left(\frac{\ell(\Delta')}{\ell(\Delta)}\right)^{\beta-\beta_0}\\
&\overset{(\dagger)}{=} \sum_{\substack{\Delta'\in\mathscr{W}(E^c)\\ \Delta'\subseteq MB_{\Delta_1}}} \mu(\Delta') \sum_{c_0^n\geq\ell(\Delta')} \sum_{\Delta\in\mathscr{M}_n(\Delta')} \left(\frac{\ell(\Delta')}{\ell(\Delta)}\right)^{\beta-\beta_0}\\
&\overset{(3.5)}{\lesssim}_{\mu,M,c_1,c_0} \sum_{\substack{\Delta'\in\mathscr{W}(E^c)\\ \Delta'\subseteq MB_{\Delta_1}}} \mu(\Delta') \sum_{n\geq 0} c_0^{n(\beta-\beta_0)}\\
&\lesssim_{\mu,\beta} \sum_{\substack{\Delta'\in W(E^c)\\ \Delta'\subseteq MB_{\Delta_1}}} \mu(\Delta') \leq \mu(MB_{\Delta_1}) \lesssim_{\mu,M,c_1,c_0} \mu(\Delta_1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

As a corollary, we have the following:

Corollary 3.4. *With the assumptions of Lemma 3.3, let* $0 < \delta < 1 < M < M_0/2$ *and set*

$$\mathscr{P}_{M,\delta} = \{\Delta : \Delta\cap E\neq\emptyset, \exists\, \xi\in MB_\Delta \text{ such that } \operatorname{dist}(\xi,E)\geq\delta\ell(\Delta)\}.$$

Then there is $C_1 = C_1(M,\delta,C_\mu) > 0$ *so that, for all* $\Delta'\subseteq\Delta_0$,

$$\sum_{\substack{\Delta\subseteq\Delta'\\ \Delta\in\mathscr{P}_{M,\delta}}} \mu(\Delta) \leq C_1\mu(\Delta'). \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. If $\Delta\in\mathscr{P}_{M,\delta}$, then there is $\xi\in MB_\Delta$ so that $\operatorname{dist}(\xi,E)\geq\delta\ell(\Delta)$, and so $B(\xi,\delta)\subseteq(M+\delta)B_\Delta\backslash E\subseteq 2MB_\Delta\backslash E$. Let Δ' be the maximal cube containing ξ so that $2MB_{\Delta'}\cap E=\emptyset$. Then $\ell(\Delta')\leq\ell(\Delta)$ since, if $\zeta\in\Delta\cap E$,

$$\begin{aligned}
2M\ell(\Delta') - \ell(\Delta) &\leq \operatorname{dist}(\zeta_{\Delta'},E) - \ell(\Delta) \leq |\zeta_{\Delta'}-\zeta| - |\zeta-\zeta_\Delta|\\
&\leq |\zeta_{\Delta'}-\zeta_\Delta| \leq |\zeta_{\Delta'}-\xi| + |\xi-\zeta_\Delta| < \ell(\Delta') + M\ell(\Delta).
\end{aligned}$$

This and the fact that $\xi \in \Delta' \cap MB_\Delta$ imply $\Delta' \subseteq 2MB_\Delta$, and thus $\lambda_{2M,\beta}(\Delta) \geq (\ell(\Delta')/\ell(\Delta))^\beta$ where we set $\beta = 2\log_2 C_\mu$. Note that $\ell(\Delta') \geq \frac{\delta c_0}{2M}\ell(\Delta)$, since otherwise if Δ'' is the parent of Δ', then $\xi \in \Delta''$ and so

$$MB_{\Delta''} \subseteq B(\xi, 2M\ell(\Delta'')) = B(\xi, 2Mc_0\ell(\Delta')) \subseteq B(\xi, \delta\ell(\Delta)) \subseteq E^c,$$

but we know that, since Δ' is maximal, $MB_{\Delta''} \cap E \neq \emptyset$, and we get a contradiction. Thus, we have shown $\lambda_{2M,\beta(\Delta)}(\Delta) \geq \left(\frac{\delta c_0}{2M}\right)^\beta$ whenever $\Delta \in \mathscr{P}_{M,\delta}$, and the previous lemma implies (3.6). □

Lemma 3.5. *With the assumptions of Lemma 3.3, and supposing $E \subseteq c_0 B_{\Delta_0} \subseteq \Delta_0 \in \mathscr{D}$ is a Borel set satisfying $\mu(E)/\mu(\Delta_0) \geq \rho > 0$, we have that for all $\delta, \tau > 0$, there are $t_0, N > 0$ (depending on δ, C_μ, M, and ρ) such that for $t \in (0, t_0)$, we can find a collection T of cubes in Δ_0, and a compact set $E' \subseteq E$ so that the following are true.*

(1) $\mu(E') \geq (1-\tau)\mu(E)$.
(2) If $\xi \in \Delta \cap E'$ for some $\Delta \in T$, then $\xi \in (1-t)\Delta$.
(3) If $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_0$ and $\Delta \cap E' \neq \emptyset$, then either $\Delta \in T$ or, for every $\xi \in MB_\Delta$, $\operatorname{dist}(\xi, E) < \delta\ell(\Delta)$.
(4) For all $\Delta' \in \mathscr{D}$,

$$\sum_{\substack{\Delta \subseteq \Delta' \\ \Delta \in T}} \mu(\Delta) \lesssim_{\mu,\tau,\delta,M} \mu(\Delta'). \tag{3.7}$$

(5) Finally, we also have that, for every $\xi \in E'$, ξ is contained in at most N cubes from T.

Proof. Let $\mathscr{P} = \mathscr{P}_{M,\delta}$ be from Corollary 3.4. For $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_0$, let $k(\Delta)$ denote the number of cubes in $\mathscr{P}$ properly containing Δ (so $k(\Delta_0) = 0$). For $N > 0$, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{\substack{\Delta \subseteq \Delta_0 \\ k(\Delta) \geq N}} \Delta\right) \leq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\Delta \in \mathscr{P}} \mu(\Delta) \overset{(3.6)}{\leq} \frac{C_1}{N}\mu(\Delta_0).$$

Thus, if $\tau \in (0,1)$, $N > \frac{2C_1}{\tau\rho}$, and

$$E_N := E \setminus \bigcup_{\substack{\Delta \subseteq \Delta_0 \\ k(\Delta) \geq N}} \Delta$$

then

$$\mu(E_N) \geq (1 - \tau/2)\mu(E).$$

Set

$$T = \{\Delta \subseteq \Delta_0 : \Delta \cap E_N \neq \emptyset\} \cap \mathscr{P}.$$

By Lemma 3.2 and (3.6), if $t < t_0 := \left(\frac{\tau\rho}{2C_1 t_0}\right)^{1/\alpha}$, then

$$\sum_{\Delta\in\mathscr{P}} \mu(\Delta\backslash(1-t)\Delta) \leq t_0 t^\alpha \sum_{\Delta\in T} \mu(\Delta) \leq C_1 t_0 t^\alpha \mu(\Delta_0) < \frac{\tau}{2}\mu(E). \quad (3.8)$$

Thus, if

$$E' = E_N \cap \left(\bigcup_{\Delta\in T} \Delta\backslash(1-t)\Delta\right)^c \quad (3.9)$$

then

$$\mu(E') > (1-\tau)\mu(E).$$

Note that $E' \subseteq E_N$ guarantees ξ is in at most N many cubes from T. Finally, by replacing E' with a compact subset if necessary so that it still satisfies the previous inequality, we may assume E' is compact. □

Remark 3.6. It is this set of lemmas concerning porosity where the doubling property for harmonic measure (and hence the NTA assumption) plays the most critical role in our work. By work in [8], for example, one can generalize the results of [13] and Theorem 1.6 to domains satisfying only an interior corkscrew condition, but whose boundary is Ahlfors regular and has "uniform interior pieces of Lipschitz graphs," *a priori*. In this setting, harmonic measure isn't necessarily doubling, and so one only obtains a "weak" A_∞-condition or "weak" reverse Hölder inequality (which implies the stronger A_∞-condition if ω happens to be doubling). Thus, one could perhaps generalize our results in this way via constructing $\Omega^\pm_{E'}$ satisfying interior corkscrew conditions and using the comparison principle; however, we also use the doubling property to construct these ideal subsets E' that guarantee that our domains $\Omega^\pm_{E'}$ have Ahlfors regular boundaries. It's because of this that a generalization is even less immediate.

4. THE SETS $\Omega^\pm_E$

We will use a pretty general method for constructing sub and super NTA domains that intersect a prescribed portion of the boundary, and later prove that, given a clever choice of subset $E' \subseteq E$ (where E is as in Theorem 1.8), the sub and super NTA domains containing E' in their boundaries have the desired properties. The constructions of the subdomains are common knowledge (see [18] or [21], for example), but the existence of superdomains is not, to the author's knowledge, and so we include a construction in the appendix.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a C-NTA (or C-uniform) domain and let $E \subseteq B(\xi_0, r_0)\cap\partial\Omega$ be compact where $\xi_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $r_0 \in (0, \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega)$. Set*

$C_0 > 0$ and

$$\mathscr{C}_E^- = \{Q \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega) : C_0 Q \cap E \neq \emptyset, \ell(Q) \leq r_0\}.$$

For $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)$, let P_{Q_1,Q_2} be a shortest path of adjacent dyadic Whitney cubes connecting Q_1 to Q_2 (which also includes Q_1 and Q_2). For some constant $\tilde{C} > 0$, set

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{C}_E}^- = \{Q : Q \in P_{Q_1,Q_2} \text{ for some } Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathscr{C}_E^- \text{ with } d_\Omega(Q_1, Q_2) \leq \tilde{C}\}.$$

For $\lambda > 1$, set

$$\Omega_E^- = \left(\bigcup_{Q \in \widetilde{\mathscr{C}_E}^-} \lambda Q \right)^\circ.$$

Then for C_0 and $\tilde{C}$ large enough and $\lambda > 1$ close enough to 1(each depending only on C and d), Ω_E^- is a C^--NTA (or C^--uniform) domain contained in $B(\xi_0, C^- r_0)$ for some $C^- = C^-(d, C_0, \lambda, C)$ and $\operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega_E^- \geq r_0/C^-$. Moreover, $\partial\Omega_E^- \cap \partial\Omega = E$.

As mentioned earlier, we will omit the proof of Lemma 4.1, but for an idea of the construction, see [21, Lemma 6.3] or [18, Lemma 3.61] for example.

Lemma 4.2. *Let Ω be a C-NTA (or C-uniform) domain, and $E \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap B(\xi_0, r_0)$ be compact where $\xi_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $r_0 \in (0, \operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega)$. Let $K \geq 3, \lambda > 1$ and set*

$$\mathscr{C}_E^+ = \{Q \in \mathscr{W}_K(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \backslash E) : Q \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Define

$$\Omega_E^+ = \Omega \cup \bigcup_{Q \in \mathscr{C}_E^+} (\lambda Q)^\circ.$$

Then, for $\lambda > 1$ close enough to 1 (depending on C and d) and K large enough (depending on d, λ and C), there is $C^+ = C^+(d, C, K)$ so that Ω_E^+ is a C^+-NTA (or C^+-uniform) domain. Moreover, $\partial\Omega_E^+ \cap \partial\Omega = E$. If Ω is C-NTA, then $\operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega_E^+ \sim_{C^+} \operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega$.

For a proof, see the appendix.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $C' > 0$, Ω, E, and $\Omega_E^\pm$ be as in Lemma 4.1 or Lemma 4.2. Suppose also that there is an L-bi-Lipschitz injection $g : E \to Z$ where Z is a metric space satisfying* (1.2) *and that for all $\xi \in E$ and $r > 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{Q \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E^\pm(\xi, r)} \ell(Q)^d \leq C' r^d \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$\partial\mathscr{C}_E^-(\xi,r) = \{Q \in \mathscr{C}_E^- : Q \cap B(\xi,r) \neq \emptyset, Q \sim Q' \text{ for some } Q' \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)\backslash\mathscr{C}_E^-\} \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\partial\mathscr{C}_E^+(\xi,r) = \{Q \in \mathscr{C}_E{}^+ : Q \cap B(\xi,r) \neq \emptyset, Q \sim Q' \text{ for some } Q' \in \mathscr{W}_K(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}\backslash E)\backslash\mathscr{C}_E^+\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Then $\partial\Omega_E^\pm$ is upper $A^\pm$-Ahlfors regular (with $A^\pm = A^\pm(C, C', A, L, d)$), meaning

$$\mathscr{H}^d(B(\xi,r)\cap\partial\Omega_E^\pm) \leq A^\pm r^d \text{ for all } \xi \in \partial\Omega_E^\pm \text{ and } r > 0. \quad (4.4)$$

If Ω is also C-NTA, then $\partial\Omega_E^\pm$ is $A^\pm$-Ahlfors regular.

Proof. **Claim:** : For all $r > 0$, if

$$\partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}}_E^-(\xi,r) = \{Q \in \widetilde{\mathscr{C}_E}^- : \lambda Q \cap B(\xi,r) \neq \emptyset, Q \sim Q' \text{ for some } Q' \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)\backslash\widetilde{\mathscr{C}_E}^-\} \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$\partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}}_E^+(\xi,r) = \{Q \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E{}^+ : \lambda Q \cap B(\xi,r) \neq \emptyset, Q \sim Q' \text{ for some } Q' \in \mathscr{W}_K(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}\backslash E)\backslash\partial\mathscr{C}_E^+\} \quad (4.6)$$

then

$$\sum_{Q\in\partial\widetilde{\mathscr{C}}_E^\pm(\xi,r)} \ell(Q)^d \lesssim_{C',d,K,\tilde{C},C} r^d. \quad (4.7)$$

We first focus on $\partial\mathscr{C}_E^+(\xi,r)$. If $Q \in \partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}}_E^+(\xi,r)$, then $\lambda Q \cap B(\xi,r) \neq \emptyset$, and by Definition 2.1,

$$\ell(Q) \leq r/\left(\frac{K-1}{2} - \sqrt{d+1}\frac{\lambda-1}{2}\right) < 4r/(K-1) \quad (4.8)$$

for $\lambda > 1$ close enough to 1, and so $\operatorname{diam}\lambda Q \leq 4\lambda\sqrt{d+1}r/(K-1)$. Hence $Q \subseteq B(\xi, (4\lambda\sqrt{d+1}/(K-1)+1)r)$, and so

$$\sum_{Q\in\partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}}_E^+(\xi,r)} \ell(Q)^d \leq \sum_{Q\in\partial\mathscr{C}_E^+(\xi,(4\lambda\sqrt{d+1}/(K-1)+1)r)} \ell(Q)^d \overset{(4.1)}{\lesssim}_{K,d} r^d$$

which proves the claim in this case.

In the case of $\partial\mathscr{C}_E^-(\xi,r)$, if $Q \in \partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}}_E^-(\xi,r)$, (4.8) still holds with $K = 3$. Moreover, there is a chain of Whitney cubes of length $\tilde{C}$ of Whitney cubes from Q to a cube $Q' \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E^-$, each cube in the chain having diameter

comparable to $\ell(Q)$ (with constants depending on d and $\tilde{C}$), so in particular, $\operatorname{dist}(Q, Q') \lesssim_{\tilde{C},d} \ell(Q) \leq 2r$ and $\ell(Q') \sim_{\tilde{C},d} \ell(Q)$, and so

$$\operatorname{dist}(\xi, Q') \leq \operatorname{dist}(\xi, Q) + \operatorname{diam} Q + \operatorname{dist}(Q, Q') \lesssim_{\tilde{C},d} r.$$

Thus, there is C'' depending on d and $\tilde{C}$ so that $Q' \subseteq B(\xi, C''r)$. Also, to each $R \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E^-$, there are at most $N = N(\tilde{C}, d)$ cubes $Q \in \partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}_E^-}$ with $Q' = R$. Thus,

$$\sum_{Q \in \partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}_E^-}(\xi,r)} \ell(Q)^d \sim_{\tilde{C},d} \sum_{Q \in \partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}_E^-}(\xi,r)} \ell(Q')^d \lesssim_{\tilde{C},d} \sum_{R \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E^-(\xi,C''r)} \ell(R)^d \overset{(4.1)}{\lesssim}_{\tilde{C},d} r^d.$$

Thus we've finished the claim.

Now we will prove (4.4).

(1) Suppose $\operatorname{dist}(\xi, E) \geq 2r$. Let $Q \in \partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}_E^{\pm}}(\xi, r)$ and $y_Q \in B(\xi, r) \cap \partial\lambda Q$. Then $Q \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)$ or $Q \in \mathscr{C}_E^+ \subseteq \mathscr{W}_K(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \backslash E)$ (depending on whether we're considering Ω_E^- or Ω_E^+; if the former, we set $K = 3$), so by Definition 2.1, for $\lambda > 1$ small enough (recall $K \geq 3$)

$$\ell(Q) \leq \frac{\operatorname{dist}(Q, E)}{\frac{K-1}{2} - \sqrt{d+1}\frac{\lambda-1}{2}} \leq 2 \operatorname{dist}(Q, E) \leq 2r.$$

Thus, since $\lambda Q \cap B(\xi, r) \neq \emptyset$,

$$\lambda Q \subseteq B(\xi, r + \operatorname{diam} \lambda Q) \subseteq B(\xi, (1 + 2\lambda\sqrt{d+1})r).$$

Moreover,

$$\ell(Q) \geq \frac{\operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E)}{(1 + K + (\lambda - 1)/2)} \gtrsim_K \operatorname{dist}(\xi, E) - |y_Q - \xi| > r.$$

Thus, $B(\xi, r) \cap \partial\Omega_E^{\pm}$ is in the union of the boundaries of finitely many cubes of the form λQ where the Q have diameters comparable to r and is contained in a ball of radius comparable to r; this implies $\mathscr{H}^d(B(\xi, r) \cap \partial\Omega_E^{\pm}) \lesssim_{d,\lambda} r^d$ (where the implied constant depends on K in the case of Ω_E^+).

(2) If $\operatorname{dist}(\xi, E) < 2r$, let $\xi' \in E$ be such that $|\xi' - \xi| < 2r$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{H}^d(\partial\Omega_E^{\pm} \cap B(\xi, r)) &\leq \mathscr{H}^d(\partial\Omega_E^{\pm} \cap B(\xi', 2r)) \\
&\leq \sum_{Q \in \partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}_E^{\pm}}(\xi', 2r)} \mathscr{H}^d(\partial\lambda Q) + \mathscr{H}^d(E \cap B(\xi', 3r)) \\
&\lesssim_{\lambda,d} \sum_{Q \in \partial\widehat{\mathscr{C}_E^{\pm}}(\xi', 2r)} \mathscr{H}^d(\partial\lambda Q) + L^d \mathscr{H}_Z^d(g(E \cap B(\xi', 2r))) \\
&\overset{(4.7)}{\lesssim}_{\lambda,d} r^d + L^d \mathscr{H}_Z^d(B_Z(\xi', 2Lr)) \overset{(1.2)}{\lesssim}_{A,L,d} r^d
\end{aligned}$$

and this proves (4.4). Note that (1.2) is given only for radii at most r_0, but since $E \subseteq B(\xi_0, r_0)$, it also holds for all $r > 0$ with perhaps a slightly larger constant.

This proves the lemma for the case of C-uniform Ω. If Ω is C-NTA, so are $\Omega_E^{\pm}$ and it is well known that C-NTA domains are lower regular (that is, the lower bound in (1.1)) with constant depending on C and d. To see this, let $B(x, r/C) \subseteq B(\xi, r) \cap \Omega_E^{\pm}$ and $B(y, r/C) \subseteq B(\xi, r) \backslash \Omega_E^{\pm}$, let P_x and P_y be two parallel d-planes passing through x and y respectively, and let $D_x = B(x, r/C) \cap P_x$ and $D_y \cap P_y \cap B(y, r/C)$. Note that each segment perpendicular to P_x and passing from D_x to D_y must intersect $\partial\Omega_E^{\pm}$, and thus if π is the orthogonal projection onto P_x,

$$\mathscr{H}^d(\partial\Omega_E^{\pm} \cap B(\xi, r)) \geq \mathscr{H}^d(\pi(\partial\Omega_E^{\pm} \cap B(\xi, r))) \geq \mathscr{H}^d(D_x) \gtrsim_{C,d} r^d.$$

□

Thus, the main challenge in proving Theorem 1.10 is to show how our assumptions imply (4.1) holds for E, or in the case of Theorem 1.8, to show (4.1) holds for some special subset E'.

5. The proof of Theorem 1.8

We now apply the results of the previous sections to prove Theorem 1.8. We state here our standing assumptions that will hold throughout this section:

Standing assumptions for this section: We will assume Ω is a C-NTA domain, $E \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap B(\xi_0, r_0)$, $g : E \to Z$ is a L-bi-Lipschitz injection into a metric space Z satisfying (1.2), $r_0 \in (0, \operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega)$, $\xi_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $B(z_0, r_0/C) \subseteq \Omega$, $\omega = \omega_\Omega^{z_0}$, and $\omega(E)/\omega(B(\xi_0, r_0)) \geq \rho > 0$. We will also assume that $\mathscr{D}$ are the "cubes" for $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ with $c_0 < c_1/4$ fixed, and without loss of generality, that $B(\xi_0, r_0) = B(\zeta_{\Delta_0}, c_1\ell(\Delta_0))$ (we can do this by rescaling Ω and by choosing the maximal nets in Theorem 3.1 to include ξ_0). We will also let $B_\Delta = B(\zeta_\Delta, \ell(\Delta))$ denote a *Euclidean ball*, not a ball with respect to the relative topology of $\partial\Omega$, though we still have $\partial\Omega \cap c_1 B_\Delta \subseteq \Delta \subseteq B_\Delta \cap \partial\Omega$ for $\Delta \in \mathscr{D}$, so in particular, $E \subseteq c_0 B_{\Delta_0} \cap \Sigma \subseteq \Delta_0$. Let $M > 0$ be large and $\delta > 0$ to be determined later.

Note that by (2.5), we can apply Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.5 with $\mu = \omega$, $\tau > 0$, some numbers $\delta, M > 0$ to be chosen later, and $\rho \frac{\omega(B(\xi_0, r_0))}{\omega(\Delta_0)}$ in place of ρ. From this lemma, we obtain the quantities t_0 and N, and for $t \in (0, t_0)$, we get a compact set E' and a collection of cubes T, where for now we pick

$t \in (0, t_0)$ small enough (depending on c_1) so that

$$(c_1/2)B_\Delta \cap \partial\Omega \subseteq \Delta\backslash(1-t)\Delta \text{ for } \Delta \in \mathscr{D} \tag{5.1}$$

In Theorem 1.8, the last conclusion follows from the penultimate one, and that one follows from the first five conclusions and Lemma 2.6, so we need only prove those. Let $\Omega^{\pm}_{E'}$ be the NTA domains from Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, where we will pick C_0 in the course of the proof sufficiently large. These and the set E' already satisfy conclusions (1) through (4), so we only have to demonstrate that they are Ahlfors regular. By Lemma 4.3, it suffices to show (4.1).

With all these reductions and assumptions in place, Theorem 1.8 will now follow from the following lemma

Lemma 5.1. *Fix $\tau \in (0,1)$, let $E' \subseteq E$ be the set from Lemma 3.5 for our choice of τ, $\rho\frac{\omega(B(\xi_0,r_0))}{\omega(\Delta_0)}$ in place of ρ, and some M and δ and $\mu = \omega$, and $\Omega^{\pm}_{E'}$ be as in Lemma 4.1 or Lemma 4.2 applied to the set E'. Then*

$$\sum_{Q \in \partial\mathscr{C}^{\pm}_{E'}(\xi,r)} \ell(Q)^d \lesssim r^d \text{ for all } \xi \in E' \text{ and } r > 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1. The sum in (5.2) will be controlled using two different bookkeeping lemmas.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $E' \subseteq E \subseteq B(\xi_0, r_0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, and $r \in (0, 3r_0)$, and $\mathscr{C}$ be any collection of disjoint cubes $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Suppose $y_Q \in E\backslash\overline{E'}$ are points in E such that*

(1) $\operatorname{dist}(y_Q, Q) \lesssim \operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E') \sim \operatorname{dist}(Q, E') \sim \ell(Q)$,
(2) for all $Q \in \mathscr{C}$, $\operatorname{dist}(Q, E') < r$,
(3) there is an L-bi-Lipschitz injection $g : E \to Z$ into a metric space Z satisfying (1.2)*.*

Then $\sum_{Q\in\mathscr{C}} \ell(Q)^d \lesssim r^d$ (with constant depending on d, L, the constants in (1.2)*, and all implied constants).*

Proof. Let $\mathscr{D}_Z$ denote the "cubes" for Z and $F = g(E')$. Let $\mathscr{W}(Z\backslash F) \subseteq \mathscr{D}_Z$ denote the collection of maximal cubes Δ for which $3B_\Delta \cap F = \emptyset$. One can show $\ell(\Delta) \sim \operatorname{dist}(\xi, F)$ for all $\xi \in \Delta \in \mathscr{W}(Z\backslash F)$. Let $\Delta_Q \in \mathscr{W}(Z\backslash F)$ contain $g(y_Q)$; we know such a cube exists since

$$\operatorname{dist}(g(y_Q), F) \geq L^{-1} \operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E') > 0.$$

Note that

$$\ell(Q) \sim \operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E') \sim \operatorname{dist}(g(y_Q), F) \sim \ell(\Delta_Q).$$

Claim: There is $N_0 = N_0(d, L)$ so that at most N_0 many $Q \in \mathscr{C}$ can satisfy $\Delta_Q = \Delta$ for some given $\Delta \in \mathscr{W}(Z\backslash F)$. To see this, note

$$\operatorname{dist}(y_Q, Q) \lesssim \operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E') \sim \ell(\Delta_Q) = \ell(\Delta),$$

and if $\Delta_Q = \Delta_{Q'} = \Delta$, then $|y_Q - y'_Q| \leq L|g(y_Q) - g(y_{Q'})| \leq \operatorname{diam}\Delta \sim \ell(\Delta)$. Thus, all cubes Q for which $\Delta_Q = \Delta$ are contained in a ball of radius comparable to $\ell(\Delta)$ and have side lengths comparable to $\ell(\Delta)$. This proves the claim.

Since each $Q \in \mathscr{C}$ intersects $B(\xi, r)$,

$$\ell(\Delta_Q) \sim \operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E') \sim \ell(Q) \sim \operatorname{dist}(Q, E') \leq r$$

and if we fix a $Q_0 \in \mathscr{C}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{dist}(g(y_{Q_0}), \Delta_Q) &\leq |g(y_{Q_0}) - g(y_Q)| \lesssim_L |y_{Q_0} - y_Q| \\ &\leq \operatorname{dist}(y_{Q_0}, Q_0) + \operatorname{diam} Q_0 + \operatorname{dist}(Q_0, Q) + \operatorname{diam} Q + \operatorname{dist}(y_Q, Q) \\ &\lesssim \ell(Q_0) + \ell(Q_0) + 2r + \ell(Q) + \ell(Q) \lesssim r\end{aligned}$$

thus, all the Δ_Q are contained in a ball $B = B_Z(g(\xi), C'r)$ for some C' depending on L, d and the implied constants. Moreover, since $\ell(\Delta_Q) \sim \ell(Q) \leq r < 3r_0$, there is $\theta < c_1$ so that $\theta\ell(\Delta_Q) < r_0$, ($\theta < c_1$ guarantees $\theta B_\Delta \subseteq \Delta$). Thus, if $C'r < r_0$, we can apply part (3) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{Q\in\mathscr{C}} \ell(Q)^d &\lesssim_{N_0} \sum_{\substack{\Delta\in\mathscr{W}(Z\backslash F)\\ \Delta\subseteq B}} \ell(\Delta)^d \lesssim_A \sum_{\substack{\Delta\in\mathscr{W}(Z\backslash F)\\ \Delta\subseteq B}} \mathscr{H}^d_Z(\theta B_\Delta) \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{\Delta\in\mathscr{W}(Z\backslash F)\\ \Delta\subseteq B}} \mathscr{H}^d_Z(\Delta) \leq \mathscr{H}^d_Z(B) \lesssim_A r^d.\end{aligned}$$

If $C'r \geq r_0$, we can cover E with a bounded number (depending on d and L) of balls B_i centered on E with radii less than $\frac{r_0}{2L}$, and thus we can cover $g(E)$ with a finite number of balls B'_i centered on it of radii less than $r_0/2$. For θ small enough, $\theta B_{\Delta_Q} \subseteq \bigcup 2B'_i$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{Q\in\mathscr{C}} \ell(Q)^d &\lesssim_{N_0} \sum_{\substack{\Delta\in\mathscr{W}(Z\backslash F)\\ \theta B_\Delta\subseteq\bigcup B'_i}} \ell(\Delta)^d \lesssim_A \sum_{\substack{\Delta\in\mathscr{W}(Z\backslash F)\\ \theta B_\Delta\subseteq\bigcup B'_i}} \mathscr{H}^d_Z(\theta B_\Delta) \\ &\leq \mathscr{H}^d_Z\left(\bigcup B'_i\right) \lesssim r_0^d \lesssim_A r^d.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *Let T be the collection of cubes from Lemma 3.5 and $T_{\Delta'}$ be those cubes in T contained in Δ' that intersect E'. Then for all $\Delta' \subseteq \Delta_0$,*

$$\sum_{\Delta\in T_{\Delta'}} \ell(\Delta)^d \lesssim_{L,d,C,\tau} \ell(\Delta')^d. \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. First note that, if $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_0$ and $\Delta \cap E' \neq \emptyset$, then there is $\xi_\Delta \in (1-t)\Delta \cap E'$ by Lemma 3.5. Hence, the collection $\{B(\xi_\Delta, t\ell(\Delta)) : \Delta \subseteq \Delta_0, \Delta \in \mathscr{D}_n, \Delta \cap E' \neq \emptyset\}$ is a disjoint family of balls with centers in $E' \subseteq Z$.

Let $B^\Delta := B_Z(g(\xi_\Delta), \frac{t}{2L}\ell(\Delta)) \subseteq Z$. If $y \in B^\Delta \cap B^{\Delta'}$ for some $\Delta, \Delta' \in \mathscr{D}_n \cap T$, then $|\xi_\Delta - \xi_{\Delta'}| < tc_0^n$, so that $B(\xi_\Delta, t\ell(\Delta))$ and $B(\xi_{\Delta'}, t\ell(\Delta'))$ intersect, giving a contradiction. Thus, for any $y \in Z$, there is at most one $\Delta \in \mathscr{D}_n \cap T$ containing y, and thus there are at most N cubes Δ from T so that $y \in B^\Delta$. Also, note that $\Delta, \tilde{\Delta} \in T_{\Delta'}$ implies

$$|g(\xi_\Delta) - g(\xi_{\tilde{\Delta}})| \leq L|\xi_\Delta - \xi_{\tilde{\Delta}}| < 2L\ell(\Delta')$$

and so all the B_Δ lie in $B_Z(g(\xi_{\tilde{\Delta}}), (2L+\frac{t}{2L})\ell(\Delta')) \subseteq \tilde{B} := B_Z(g(\xi_{\tilde{\Delta}}), (2L+1)\ell(\Delta))$ for some fixed $\tilde{\Delta} \in T_{\Delta'}$.

Recalling that $r_0 = c_1\ell(\Delta_0)$, pick $\theta = c_1/2$ so that for all $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_0$, $\theta\ell(\Delta) \leq \theta\ell(\Delta_0) < r_0$. Then by (1.2), if $\zeta \in \Delta' \cap E'$ and $(2L+1)\ell(\Delta') < r_0$,

$$\sum_{\Delta \in T_{\Delta'}} \ell(\Delta)^d \lesssim_{A,d,t,c_1,L} \sum_{\Delta \in T_{\Delta'}} \mathscr{H}^d_Z(\theta B^\Delta) \leq \int_Z \sum_{\Delta \in T_{\Delta'}} \mathbb{1}_{B^\Delta}(x) d\mathscr{H}^d_Z(x)$$

$$\leq N\mathscr{H}^d_Z\left(\bigcup_{\Delta \in T_{\Delta'}} B^\Delta\right) \leq N\mathscr{H}^d_Z(\tilde{B}) \lesssim_{A,d,N} \ell(\Delta')^d.$$

Otherwise, if $(2L+1)\ell(\Delta) \geq r_0 = c_0\ell(\Delta_0)$, cover Δ_0 with $N_1 = N_1(d, L, c_1)$ many cubes Δ_j with $(2L+1)\ell(\Delta_j) < r_0$. Then

$$\sum_{\Delta \in T_{\Delta'}} \ell(\Delta)^d \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \sum_{\Delta \in T_{\Delta_j}} \ell(\Delta)^d \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \ell(\Delta_j)^d \lesssim_{L,d,c_1} \ell(\Delta_0)^d \lesssim_L \ell(\Delta').$$

□

Lemma 5.4. *The inequality* (5.2) *holds for* $\partial\mathscr{C}^-_{E'}(\xi, r)$.

Proof. **Claim:** It suffices to show (5.2) in the case when $r \leq 3r_0$. To see this, observe that, if $r > 3r_0$, then since $E' \subseteq E \subseteq B(\xi_0, r_0)$ any cube $Q \in \mathscr{C}^-_{E'} \backslash \partial\mathscr{C}^-_{E'}(\xi, 3r_0)$ is at least r_0 away from E'. By construction, however, the $Q \in \mathscr{C}^-_{E'}$ are chosen so that $\ell(Q) \leq r_0$. Since $C_0Q \cap E' \neq \emptyset$, we have that

$$r_0 \leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, E') \leq \operatorname{dist}(\xi, Q) \leq \operatorname{diam} C_0Q = C_0\sqrt{d+1}\ell(Q) \leq C_0\sqrt{d+1}r_0.$$

Thus all such Q have sizes comparable to r_0. Moreover, all cubes in $\mathscr{C}^-_{E'} \backslash \mathscr{C}^-_{E'}(\xi, r)$ lie in $B(\xi_0, C^- r_0)$ (since $\Omega^-_{E'} \subseteq B(\xi_0, C^- r_0)$) and thus there are boundedly

many of them (depending only on C_0 and d). Hence,

$$\sum_{Q\in\partial\mathscr{C}^-_{E'}(\xi,r)}\ell(Q)^d\leq\sum_{Q\in\mathscr{C}^-_{E'}\setminus\partial\mathscr{C}^-_E(\xi,3r_0)}\ell(Q)^d+\sum_{Q\in\partial\mathscr{C}^-_{E'}(\xi,3r_0)}\ell(Q)^d\lesssim_{C_0,d} r_0^d\lesssim_d r^d$$

which proves (5.2) if we assume (5.2) holds for $r\leq 3r_0$, and this proves the claim.

Now assume $r\leq 3r_0$. Set

$$\mathscr{D}(\xi,r)=\{\Delta\in\mathscr{D}(\Delta_0):\ell(\Delta)>r\geq c_0\ell(\Delta),\Delta\cap B(\xi,r)\cap E'\neq\emptyset\}.$$

Since $r\leq 3r_0=3c_1\ell(\Delta_0)<\ell(\Delta_0)$ and $E\subseteq\Delta_0$, this set is nonempty and covers $B(\xi,r)\cap E'$. Note that for $Q\in\partial\mathscr{C}^-_E(\xi,r)$,

$$\ell(Q)\leq\operatorname{dist}(Q,\partial\Omega)\leq\operatorname{dist}(\xi,Q)<r\leq 3r_0<\ell(\Delta_0);$$

this and the fact that $C_0Q\cap E'\neq\emptyset$ imply there is a maximal $\Delta(Q)\subseteq\Delta_0$ that intersects $C_0Q\cap E'$ and is such that $\ell(Q)\geq c_0\ell(\Delta(Q))$, so necessarily, $\Delta(Q)$ is contained in some cube in $\mathscr{D}(\xi,r)$ (observe also that $\ell(\Delta(Q))\sim_{c_0}\ell(Q)$). With this in mind, and the fact that $\#\mathscr{D}(\xi,r)\lesssim_C 1$, it will now suffice to show instead that

$$\sum_{Q\in C_{E'}(\tilde{\Delta})}\ell(Q)^d\lesssim r^d\text{ for }\tilde{\Delta}\in\mathscr{D}(\xi,r)\tag{5.4}$$

where

$$C_{E'}(\tilde{\Delta})=\{Q\in\partial\mathscr{C}^-_{E'}(\xi,r):\Delta(Q)\subseteq\tilde{\Delta}\}.$$

Split $C_{E'}(\tilde{\Delta})$ into sets

$$T_1=\{Q\in C_{E'}(\tilde{\Delta}):\Delta_Q\in T\},\ \ T_2=C_{E'}(\tilde{\Delta})\setminus T_1.$$

We first handle T_1. Observe that at most a bounded number of cubes Q can have $\Delta(Q)=\Delta$ for a given Δ since $\operatorname{dist}(Q,\Delta(Q))\leq C_0\operatorname{diam}Q$ and $\ell(\Delta(Q))\sim\ell(Q)$. Also, since $\Delta(Q)\cap E'\neq\emptyset$ for all $Q\in C_{E'}(\tilde{\Delta})$, we know $T_1\subseteq T_{\tilde{\Delta}}$, (recall Lemma 5.3 for this notation). Thus, we have

$$\sum_{Q\in T_1}\ell(Q)^d\lesssim\sum_{\Delta\in T_{\tilde{\Delta}}}\ell(\Delta)^d\overset{(5.3)}{\lesssim}\ell(\tilde{\Delta})^d\lesssim r^d.\tag{5.5}$$

Next, assume $Q\in T_2$. Since $Q\in\partial\mathscr{C}^-_{E'}$, there is Q' adjacent to Q so that $C_0Q'\cap E'=\emptyset$. We now pick $C_0>0$ large enough (depending on c_0) so that there is $\Delta'\subseteq C_0Q'$ with $c_0\ell(\Delta')\leq\ell(Q')\leq\ell(\Delta')$ (see Figure 2). Then

$$\ell(\Delta')\sim_{c_0}\ell(Q')\sim_d\ell(Q)\sim_{c_0}\ell(\Delta(Q))$$

and so for $M>0$ large enough, $\Delta'\subseteq MB_{\Delta(Q)}$. Since $\Delta(Q)\notin T$, if δ is small enough, then by (5.1) and Lemma 3.5, there is $y_Q\in(1-t)\Delta'\cap E$.



FIGURE 2. The cubes Q, Q' and Δ' in the case that $Q \in T_2$.

Our goal now is to verify that y_Q, Q, E, E', g, and Z satisfy the conditions of Lemma 5.2. Since $y_Q \in \Delta' \subseteq C_0 Q'$ and Q' is adjacent to Q

$$\ell(Q) \leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, \partial\Omega) \leq \operatorname{dist}(y_Q, Q) \leq \operatorname{diam} C_0 Q' + \operatorname{diam} Q' \lesssim \ell(Q),$$

$$\operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E') < 2\ell(MB_{\Delta(Q)}) \lesssim_{c_0, M} \ell(Q)$$

and since $\Delta' \cap E' = \emptyset$ and $y_Q \in (1-t)\Delta'$,

$$\operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E') \geq t\ell(\Delta') \gtrsim_{c_0} \ell(Q') \sim_d \ell(Q). \tag{5.6}$$

Moreover, $Q \cap B(\xi, r) \neq \emptyset$ for all $Q \in C_E(\tilde{\Delta}) \subseteq \partial\mathscr{C}^-_{E'}(\xi, r)$, and so by Lemma 5.2,

$$\sum_{Q \in T_2} \ell(Q)^d \lesssim r^d.$$

□

Lemma 5.5. *The inequality* (5.2) *holds for* $\partial\mathscr{C}^+_{E'}$.

Proof. The proof is basically the same as in the previous lemma, but with some minor adjustments. Let $\xi \in E'$ and $r > 0$. Again, without loss of generality, it suffices to prove (5.2) for $r \leq 3r_0$. To see this, assume it's true and let $r > 3r_0$, pick $n \geq 0$ so that $3^{n+1}r_0 \geq r > 3^n r_0$. If

$Q \in \mathscr{C}_j := \partial\mathscr{C}^+_{E'}(\xi, 3^{j+1}r_0)\backslash\partial\mathscr{C}^+_{E'}(\xi, 3^j r_0)$, then

$$\ell(Q) \leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, E') \leq \operatorname{dist}(\xi, Q) \leq 3^{n+1}r_0,$$

yet since $E' \subseteq B(\xi_0, r_0)$,

$$\ell(Q) \sim_{d,K} \operatorname{dist}(Q, E') \geq (3^n - 2)r_0 \sim 3^n r_0.$$

Thus, all cubes in $\mathscr{C}_j$ are contained in a ball centered about ξ_0 of radius comparable to $3^n r_0$ and have sidelengths comparable to $3^n r_0$. Hence,

$$\sum_{Q\in\partial\mathscr{C}^+_{E'}(\xi,r)} \ell(Q)^d \leq \sum_{Q\in\partial\mathscr{C}^+_{E'}(\xi,3^{n+1}r_0)} \ell(Q)^d$$

$$\leq \sum_{Q\in\partial\mathscr{C}^+_{E'}(\xi,3r_0)} \ell(Q)^d + \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{Q\in\mathscr{C}_j} \ell(Q)^d \lesssim_{d,K} r_0^d + \sum_{j=0}^{n}(3^n r_0)^d \lesssim 3^{nd} r_0^d \lesssim_d r^d.$$

Thus, we can assume $r \leq 3r_0$.

Define $\mathscr{D}(\xi, r)$ just as in Lemma 5.4. Note that if $Q \in \mathscr{C}^+_E(\xi, r)$, then since $Q \in \mathscr{C}^+_E \subseteq \mathscr{W}_K(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}\backslash E)$,

$$\ell(Q) \leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, E') \leq \operatorname{dist}(\xi, Q) < r \leq 3r_0 < \ell(\Delta_0).$$

Moreover, we know that the parent of Q, Q^1, satisfies $KQ^1 \cap E \neq \emptyset$. Thus, there is a maximal cube $\Delta(Q) \subseteq \Delta_0$ such that $\Delta(Q) \cap KQ^1 \cap E' \neq \emptyset$ and $c_0\ell(\Delta(Q)) \leq \ell(Q)$, so again $\Delta(Q) \in \mathscr{D}(\xi, r)$. Again, $\#\mathscr{D}(\xi, r) \lesssim_C 1$, and so it suffices to show (5.4), where now

$$C_{E'}(\tilde{\Delta}) = \{Q \in \partial\mathscr{C}^+_{E'}(\xi, r) : \Delta(Q) \subseteq \tilde{\Delta}\}.$$

Split $C_{E'}(\tilde{\Delta})$ into sets T_1 and T_2 as before. Again, (5.5) holds for the same reasons, so we're just left with estimating the sum over T_2.

For each $Q \in C_{E'}(\tilde{\Delta}) \subseteq \mathscr{C}^+_{E'}$, we have $Q \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$ by definition, so we can pick $x_Q \in Q \cap \partial\Omega$ so that $B(x_Q, \ell(Q)) \cap \partial\Omega \subseteq 3Q$. Since $\ell(Q) \sim \ell(\Delta(Q))$, we can pick M large enough (depending on d, K, and c_0) so that $MB_{\Delta(Q)} \supseteq 3Q \supseteq B(x_Q, \ell(Q))$. If δ is chosen small enough (depending on M and c_0), we can guarantee that there is $y_Q \in E \cap B(x_Q, \ell(Q))$. Moreover, since $MB_{\Delta(Q)} \supseteq 3Q \ni y_Q$, and $Q \in \mathscr{W}_K(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}\backslash E')$,

$$\operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E') \sim_{d,K} \ell(Q) \leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, E') \leq \operatorname{diam} MB_{\Delta(Q)} \lesssim \ell(Q),$$

and $\operatorname{dist}(y_Q, Q) \leq \operatorname{diam} Q$ since $y_Q \in 3Q$. Thus, we can apply Lemma 5.2 again with respect to the set E'. □

This ends the proof of Lemma 5.1.

□

As another corollary, we get the following well known fact.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a C-NTA domain with A-Ahlfors regular boundary. Let $E \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap B(\xi_0, r_0)$ be a compact set with $\xi_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $r_0 < \operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega$. Then there is a C''-NTA domain $\Omega_E \subseteq \Omega$ with A''-Ahlfors regular boundary so that $\partial\Omega_E \cap \partial\Omega = E$ and $\operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega_E \geq r_0/C''$, where $A'', C'' > 0$ depend only on A, C, and d.*

Proof. We'll just sketch some of the details. Let $\mathscr{D}$ be the cubes for $\partial\Omega$ and $\Omega_E = \Omega_E^-$ from Lemma 4.1, but pick C large enough in that lemma so that, for all $Q \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)$, $C_0 Q$ contains a cube $\Delta \in \mathscr{D}$ with $c_0 \ell(\Delta) \leq \ell(Q) < \ell(\Delta)$ and let y_Q be the center of this cube. Following a similar procedure in the proof of Lemma 5.1, we can show that y_Q, E, $Z = \partial\Omega$, and $\partial\mathscr{C} = \widetilde{\mathscr{C}_E}^-(\xi, r)$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 5.2, and so now the result follows from Lemma 4.3. □

6. Proof of Theorem 1.10

We begin by recalling some theory from [14] and [15].

Definition 6.1. An A-Ahlfors regular set $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is *uniformly rectifiable* if there are constants $L, c > 0$ such that, for all $\xi \in Z$ and $r \in (0, \operatorname{diam} Z)$, there is $E \subseteq B(\xi, r) \cap Z$ with $\mathscr{H}^d(E) \geq cr^d$ and an L-bi-Lipschitz embedding $g : E \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

For example, if Z is a bi-Lipschitz image of $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it is trivially uniformly rectifiable. There are several different equivalent definitions of this term; for example, [14] presents seven characterisations, and in [15] several more. The characterisation that will be most convenient for us, though, is one given in terms of *bilateral β-numbers*: for a set $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $\xi \in Z$, $r > 0$, and a hyperplane P passing through ξ, set

$$b\beta_Z(\xi, r, P) = \sup_{\zeta \in B(\xi,r) \cap Z} \operatorname{dist}(\zeta, P)/r + \sup_{\zeta \in B(\xi,r) \cap P} \operatorname{dist}(\zeta, Z)/r.$$

Note that by the local compactness of the Grassmanian and the continuity of $b\beta(\xi, r, P)$ in P, there exists $P_{\xi,r}$ that infimizes $b\beta(\xi, r, P)$, and we define

$$b\beta_Z(\xi, r) = b\beta_Z(\xi, r, P_{\xi,r}).$$

Theorem 6.2. [15, Theorem 2.4] *If Z is an A-Ahlfors regular set in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, then Z is uniformly rectifiable if and only if, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the set*

$$\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon = \{(\xi, r) \in Z \times (0, \infty) : b\beta_Z(\xi, r) > \varepsilon\}$$

is a Carleson set, meaning that, for all $\xi_0 \in Z$ and $r_0 > 0$, if we define $d\sigma = d\mathscr{H}^d|_Z \times \frac{dr}{r}$, then

$$\sigma(\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon \cap (B(\xi_0, r_0) \times (0, r_0))) \leq C_{UR} r_0^d \tag{6.1}$$

where C_{UR} depends on $L, d,$ and c in the definition of uniform rectifiability and vice versa.

We will say that Z is *C_{UR}-uniformly rectifiable* if it satisfies (6.1).

The original definition of $b\beta_Z$ infimizes over all hyperplanes P, not just the ones passing through ξ, but it's easy to see that this quantity is comparable to our current definition by a factor of two. Using these *centered bilateral β-numbers* will make things a bit more convenient below.

Lemma 6.3. *Let Z be a set in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, Σ a closed set whose complement is the disjoint union of two C-uniform domains $\Omega_\pm$. Let $E = Z \cap \Sigma$, $\xi \in E$, and $r > 0$. If $b\beta_Z(\xi, r) < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{8C^2}$ and $\zeta \in B(\xi, \frac{r}{2C}) \cap \Sigma$ is such that $\operatorname{dist}(\zeta, E) > (2C+1)\varepsilon r$, then there is $z \in Z \cap B(\xi, r)$ with $\operatorname{dist}(z, E) \geq \varepsilon r$.*

Proof. Let $P = P_{\xi,r}$ and ν a unit normal vector to P. Set

$$H^\pm = \{\xi + x : \pm x \cdot \nu > 0\}$$

so $P^c = H^+ \cup H^-$. Set $\xi_\pm = \xi \pm \frac{r}{4C}\nu \in H^\pm$.

Let $\zeta' \in P$ be closest to ζ and let $\zeta'' \in E$ be closest to ζ'. Since $b\beta_Z(\xi, r) < \varepsilon$ and $\zeta' \in B(\xi, \frac{r}{2C}) \cap P$

$$\operatorname{dist}(\zeta, P) = |\zeta - \zeta'| \geq |\zeta - \zeta''| - |\zeta'' - \zeta'| \geq (2C+1)\varepsilon r - \varepsilon r = 2C\varepsilon r.$$

In particular, $\zeta \notin P$, so without loss of generality, we can suppose $\zeta \in H^+$. By Definition 1.1, we can find a curve γ (contained in either Ω_+ or Ω_-) containing ζ and ξ_- such that

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\gamma) \leq C|\zeta - \xi_-| \leq C(|\zeta - \xi| + |\xi - \xi_-|) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{2C} + \frac{r}{4C}\right) = \frac{3r}{4}$$

and for all $t \in \gamma$, $\operatorname{dist}(t, \Sigma) \geq \operatorname{dist}(t, \{\zeta, \xi_-\})/C$ (see Figure 3).

Note that $\operatorname{diam}\gamma \leq \mathscr{H}^1(\gamma) \leq 3r/4$, and since $|\xi - \xi_-| = \frac{r}{4C} \leq r/4$, we have

$$\gamma \subseteq B(\xi_-, 3r/4) \subseteq B(\xi, r).$$

Since $\zeta \in H^+$ and $\xi_- \in H^-$, there is $t \in \gamma \cap P \cap B(\xi, r)$ such that

$$\operatorname{dist}(t, E) \geq \operatorname{dist}(t, \Sigma) \geq \operatorname{dist}(t, \{\zeta, \xi_-\})/C \geq \min\{2C\varepsilon r, \frac{r}{4C}\}/C = 2\varepsilon r$$

since $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{8C^2}$. Since $b\beta_Z(\xi, r) < \varepsilon$, there is $z \in Z$ such that $|t - z| < \varepsilon r$, and so

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, E) \geq \operatorname{dist}(t, E) - |t - z| \geq 2\varepsilon r - \varepsilon r = \varepsilon r.$$

□

Theorem 6.4. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a C-uniform domain so that $(\Omega^c)^\circ$ is also C-uniform. Let $E \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap B(\xi_0, r_0) \cap Z$ where Z is an A-Ahlfors regular C_{UR}-uniformly rectifiable set. Then there are $C^\pm$-NTA domains $\Omega_E^\pm$*



FIGURE 3. Since ζ is far from P, we can find a point $t \in P$ far from Σ. Since $b\beta_Z(\xi, r)$ is small, we can find a point in Z near t that will be far from Σ as well.

with $A^\pm$-Ahlfors regular boundaries so that $\Omega_E^- \subseteq \Omega \subseteq \Omega_E^+$, $\operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega_E^\pm \geq \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega/C^\pm$, and $E \subseteq \partial\Omega_E^\pm \cap \partial\Omega$. Moreover, if $\omega = \omega_\Omega^{z_0}$ where $B(z_0, r_0/C) \subseteq B(\xi_0, r_0) \cap \Omega$, then ω is A_∞-equivalent to $\mathscr{H}^d$ on E, so in particular, $\omega|_E \ll \mathscr{H}^d|_E \ll \omega|_E$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, it suffices to show for $\xi \in E$ and $r > 0$,

$$\sum_{Q \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E^\pm(\xi,r)} \ell(Q)^d \lesssim r^d \tag{6.2}$$

where $\partial\mathscr{C}_E^\pm$ are defined in (4.5) and (4.6).

We begin with $\partial\mathscr{C}_E^-(\xi, r)$. For $Q \in \mathscr{C}_E^-$, since $C_0Q \cap E \neq \emptyset$, we can select $x_Q \in E \cap C_0Q$. Let $M > 1$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{\frac{1}{(2C+1)M}, \frac{1}{8C^2}\})$, and set

$$T_1 = \{Q \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E^-(\xi, r) : b\beta(x_Q, M\ell(Q)) \geq \varepsilon\}, \;\; T_2 = \partial\mathscr{C}_E(\xi, r)\backslash T_1.$$

Let $Q \in T_1$. Note that

$$\varepsilon \leq b\beta(x_Q, M\ell(Q)) \leq 3b\beta(y, s)$$
$$\text{for } (y, s) \in T_Q := (B(x_Q, M\ell(Q)) \cap Z) \times (2M\ell(Q), 3M\ell(Q)).$$

This implies $T_Q \subseteq \mathscr{B}_{\varepsilon/3}$. Since $\ell(Q) \leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, E) \leq r$ and $x_Q \in Q$, we also have

$$T_Q \subseteq B(\xi, \operatorname{diam} C_0Q + M\ell(Q) + r) \times (0, 3M\ell(Q))$$
$$\subseteq B(\xi, M'r) \times (0, 3Mr)$$

where $M' = M + C_0\sqrt{d+1} + 1$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{Q\in T_1} \mathbb{1}_{T_Q}(x,t) \lesssim_{d,M} 1. \tag{6.3}$$

To see this, observe that if $(x,t) \in T_{Q_j}$ for some distinct cubes $Q_1, ..., Q_N$, then $t \sim M\ell(Q_j)$ for all j, and $\operatorname{dist}(x, Q_j) \leq M\ell(Q_j) \sim t$ for all j, so all Q_j are disjoint cubes of sidelights comparable to t/M contained in a ball of radius comparable to t/M, which implies $N \lesssim_{d,M} 1$. Thus,

$$\sum_{Q\in T_1} \ell(Q)^d \lesssim_{d,M} \sum_{Q\in T_1} \sigma(T_Q) \overset{(6.3)}{\lesssim}_{d,M} \sigma(\mathscr{B}_{\varepsilon/3} \cap (B(\xi, M'r) \times (0, 3Mr))) \overset{(6.1)}{\lesssim}_{M,d,C_{UR}} r^d.$$

For $Q \in T_2$, note that since $Q \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E^-$, there is $Q' \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)$ such that $Q \sim Q'$ and $C_0Q' \cap E = \emptyset$. Again, for C_0 large enough, and since $\ell(Q) \sim_d \ell(Q')$, we can guarantee that there is always $z_Q \in \partial\Omega$ such that $B(z_Q, \ell(Q)) \subseteq C_0Q'$. For M large enough, $B(z_Q, \ell(Q)) \subseteq B(x_Q, \frac{M\ell(Q)}{2C})$ (recall $x_Q \in C_0Q \cap E$), and $\operatorname{dist}(z_Q, E) \geq \ell(Q) \geq \varepsilon(2C+1)M\ell(Q)$ (since $B(z_Q, \ell(Q)) \subseteq C_0Q'$ and C_0Q' does not intersect E). Since we also have $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{8C^2}$, we can use Lemma 6.3 with $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ to show that there is $y_Q \in Z \cap B(x_Q, M\ell(Q))$ with $\operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E) \geq \varepsilon M\ell(Q)$. Since $x_Q \in E$, we have $\operatorname{dist}(y_Q, E) \leq M\ell(Q)$. Finally, since $Q \in \mathscr{W}(\Omega)$,

$$\ell(Q) \leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, \partial\Omega) \leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, E) \leq r,$$

and so we can apply Lemma 5.2 with $\mathscr{C} = T_2$ to show that

$$\sum_{Q\in T_2} \ell(Q)^d \lesssim r^d.$$

For $\partial\mathscr{C}_E^+(\xi, r)$, again, the proof is the same as above except for our choice of x_Q: For $Q \in \mathscr{C}_E^+(\xi, r)$, $Q \in \mathscr{W}_K(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}\backslash E)$, and so the parent Q^1 of Q satisfies $KQ^1 \cap E \neq \emptyset$, so we can pick $x_Q \in KQ^1$. Thus, $\operatorname{dist}(x_Q, Q) \leq 2K \operatorname{diam} Q$. We define T_1 as above, but with $M > (2K+3)\sqrt{d+1}$ so that $B(x_Q, M\ell(Q)) \supseteq 3Q$. Since $Q \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$ when $Q \in \mathscr{C}_E^+$, there is $z_Q \in Q \cap \partial\Omega$, and $B(z_Q, \ell(Q)) \subseteq 3Q$. The remainder of the proof is now just like the proof we had in the case of $\partial\mathscr{C}_E^-(\xi, r)$, and so (6.2) is proven for both cases.

The last part of the theorem now follows from Lemma 2.6. □

Proof of Theorem 1.10. We will need the following theorem.

Theorem 6.5. [6, Theorem II]. *Let $D \geq d \geq 1$ and $0 < \kappa < 1$ be given. There are constants $C' = C'(d) > 0$ and $M = M(\kappa, d)$ such that if f :*

$\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^D$ is a 1-Lipschitz function, then there are sets $E_1, ..., E_M$ such that

$$\mathscr{H}^d_\infty \left(f \left([0,1]^d \backslash \bigcup_{i=1}^{M} E_i \right) \right) \leq C' \kappa \tag{6.4}$$

and such that if $E_i \neq \emptyset$, there is $F_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^D$ which is L_0-bi-Lipschitz, $L_0 \sim_D \kappa^{-1}$, so that

$$F_i|_{E_i} = f|_{E_i}. \tag{6.5}$$

Now, let $E \subseteq \partial\Omega$ be as in the statement of Theorem 1.10. Let $A \subseteq [0, r_0]^d$ and $f : A \to E$ be L-Lipschitz. By replacing Ω with $(Lr_0)^{-1}\Omega$ and $f(x)$ with $\frac{f(Lr_0 x)}{Lr_0}$, we may assume without loss of generality that $r_0 = L^{-1}$ (note that this scaling does not affect the Lipschitz constant of f nor the ratio $\rho = \mathscr{H}^d_\infty(E)/r_0^d$). By Kirszbraun's theorem, we may extend f so it is defined on all of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and is still L-Lipschitz. Let $F(x) = f(x/L)$ so that F is a 1-Lipschitz map and $F([0,1]^d) \supseteq E$. Let $\kappa = \eta \mathscr{H}^d_\infty(E)/C' = \frac{\eta\rho}{L^d C'}$ and apply Theorem 6.5 to F to obtain sets $E_1, ..., E_M$ with $M = M(\kappa, d)$ and L_0-bi-Lipschitz functions $F_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ satisfying (6.4) and (6.5), where $L_0 \sim_d \kappa^{-1}$. The sets $Z_i = F_i(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are C_{UR}-uniformly rectifiable sets with C_{UR} depending on d and L_0 (or rather, d, η, L, and ρ). Let $F_i = Z_i \cap E$. By Theorem 6.4, ω is A_∞-equivalent to $\mathscr{H}^d$ on F_i, thus ω is also A_∞-equivalent to $\mathscr{H}^d$ on the finite union $E' = \bigcup_{i=1}^M F_i$. Finally

$$\mathscr{H}^d_\infty(E \backslash E') \leq \mathscr{H}^d_\infty \left(F \left([0,1]^d \backslash \bigcup_{i=1}^{M} E_i \right) \right) \leq C' \kappa = \eta \mathscr{H}^d_\infty(E).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.11. We simply iterate using Theorem 1.10 on the set E to exhaust $\mathscr{H}^d$-almost all of E with rectifiable sets upon each of which $\mathscr{H}^d$ and ω are mutually absolutely continuous. □

7. Appendix

7.1. **The proof of Lemma 4.2.** Lemma 4.2 will follow from the following lemmas. Again, we assume that $E \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap B(\xi_0, r_0)$ where Ω is C-uniform (unless specified otherwise), $\xi_0 \in \partial\Omega$, and $r_0 \in (0, \operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega)$.

Lemma 7.1. *If $\partial\Omega$ is bounded, then* $\operatorname{diam} \Omega^+_E \lesssim_d \operatorname{diam} \Omega$.

Proof. If $r \geq \operatorname{diam} \partial\Omega$, then $\partial\Omega$ is a bounded set, thus if $Q \in \mathscr{C}^+_E \subseteq \mathscr{W}_K(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \backslash E)$, $\ell(Q) \leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, E) \leq \operatorname{diam} \Omega$, and since each such Q intersects $\partial\Omega$, the lemma follows. □

Lemma 7.2. *If Ω is C-NTA, then for K large enough (depending on λ, C, and d), Ω_E^+ satisfies the exterior corkscrew condition. In particular, $(\Omega_E^+)^c$ contains a ball of radius $\frac{r_0}{4C}$.*

Proof. Let $\xi \in \partial\Omega_E^+$ and $r \in (0, \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega)$.

(1) Suppose $\operatorname{dist}(\xi, E) < r/2$. Pick $\xi' \in E$ with $|\xi - \xi'| < r/2$. Let $B = B(z, \frac{r}{2C}) \subseteq \Omega\backslash B(\xi', r/2)$. If $\lambda Q \cap B(\xi', r) \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{K-1}{2}\ell(Q) &\leq \operatorname{dist}(Q, E) \leq \operatorname{diam} Q + \operatorname{dist}(\lambda Q, E)\\ &\leq \sqrt{d+1}\ell(Q) + \operatorname{dist}(\xi', Q) \leq \sqrt{d+1}\ell(Q) + r\end{aligned}$$

and so $\ell(Q) \leq r/K'$ where $K' = \frac{K-1}{2} - \sqrt{d+1}$. Thus

$$\operatorname{diam}\lambda Q = \lambda\sqrt{d+1}\ell(Q) \leq \frac{\lambda\sqrt{d+1}}{K'}r < \frac{r}{4C}$$

for $K' > 4\lambda C$, and thus each such λQ is contained in a ball of radius $\frac{r}{4C}$ centered upon Σ, and since $\operatorname{dist}(\frac{1}{2}B, \Sigma) \geq \frac{r}{4C}$, we have $\lambda Q \cap \frac{1}{2}B = \emptyset$. Since $\frac{1}{2}B \subseteq \Omega^c$ as well,

$$\frac{1}{2}B \subseteq (\Omega_E^+)^c \cap B(\xi', r/2) \subseteq B(\xi, r)\backslash\Omega_E^+.$$

Clearly, $\operatorname{diam}(\frac{1}{2}B) \sim r$, and so we've proven the lemma in this case. Observe that, since $r_0 < \operatorname{diam}\Omega$, the second part of the lemma is now proven.

(2) Suppose $\operatorname{dist}(\xi, E') \geq r/2 > 0$. Then $\xi \in \partial\lambda Q$ for some $Q \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E^+$ that intersects Σ. Again, all cubes adjacent to Q have comparable diameters, so for λ close enough to one, if $R \in \partial\mathscr{C}_E^+$ is the dyadic cube containing ξ, then $R \notin \partial\mathscr{C}_E^+$, $\ell(R) \sim \ell(Q)$, and $R' = R\backslash\Omega_E^+$ is a rectangular prism with edges all of length comparable to $\ell(Q) \gtrsim \operatorname{dist}(\xi, E') \geq r/2$. It is not hard to see then that $B(\xi, r) \cap R'$ contains a ball of size comparable to r.

If $r \in [\operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega, \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega_E^+)$, then the previous lemma implies

$$r < \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega_E^+ \lesssim_{K,d} \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega.$$

By the previous two cases, we know that $B(\xi, \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega/2)$ contains a ball of radius comparable to $\operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega/2 \sim_{K,d} r$, and thus we've proven the lemma. □

Lemma 7.3. *Ω_E^+ is uniform.*

Proof. We will establish the lemma using Definition 1.1. Let $x, y \in \Omega_E^+$.

(1) First suppose $y \in \Omega$.
   (a) If $x \in \Omega$, then this case follows since Ω is uniform.

(b) If $x \notin \Omega$, then $x \in \lambda Q$ for some $Q \in \mathscr{C}_E^+$. If $\hat{Q}$ is the union of λS over all $S \in \mathscr{C}_E^+$ that intersect Q and $y \in \hat{Q}$, then this case follows since λQ is uniform.

(c) Suppose $y \notin \hat{Q}$ but $|x-y| < \varepsilon \ell(Q)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ to be chosen shortly. For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, this must mean that $y \in \Omega$, for otherwise $y \in \lambda S$ for some $S \in \mathscr{C}_E^+$ and ε small enough implies $S \cap Q \neq \emptyset$, meaning that $y \in \hat{Q}$. Let $z \in \partial\Omega_E^+$ be closest to y, so $|y-z| \leq |x-y| < \varepsilon\ell(Q)$. Then $z \in S$ for some $S \in \mathscr{C}_E^+$, since $\operatorname{dist}(z,E) \geq \operatorname{dist}(x,E) - |x-z| \geq \frac{K-1}{2}\ell(Q) - \varepsilon\ell(Q) > \frac{K-1}{4} > 0$ for ε small enough depending on K. In particular, this means $\ell(S) \gtrsim \ell(Q)$, and so for ε small enough, depending on λ, $y \in \lambda S$, a contradiction.

(d) Now suppose $y \notin \hat{Q}$, $|x-y| \geq \varepsilon\ell(Q)$, but assume $y \in \Omega$. Let $\xi \in \partial\Omega \cap Q$, and let

$$B(x', \frac{\lambda-2}{4C}\ell(Q)) \subseteq B(\xi, \frac{\lambda-2}{4}\ell(Q)) \cap \Omega \subseteq \frac{\lambda}{2}Q \cap \Omega$$

be a corkscrew ball. Since λQ is uniform, there is a good curve γ_1 between x and x' in λQ and is also a good curve in Ω_E^+. Furthermore, since $x' \in \Omega$, there is a good curve γ_2 connecting x' and y. Let $\gamma = \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$. Then

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\gamma) \leq \mathscr{H}^1(\gamma_1) + \mathscr{H}^1(\gamma_2) \lesssim |x-x'| + |x'-y| \lesssim \ell(Q) + |x-y| \lesssim |x-y|.$$

Let $z \in \gamma$. If $z \in B(x', \frac{\lambda-2}{4C}\ell(Q)) \cap \gamma \subseteq \frac{\lambda}{2}Q$, then

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Omega_E^+) \geq \frac{\lambda-2}{4}\ell(Q) \gtrsim |z-x|.$$

If $z \notin B(x', \frac{\lambda-2}{4C}\ell(Q))$, then either $z \in \gamma_1$, in which case

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Omega_E^+) \gtrsim \min\{|z-x|, |z-x'|\} \gtrsim \min\{|z-x|, \ell(Q)\} \gtrsim |z-x|$$

or $z \in \gamma_2$, in which case

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Omega_E^+) \gtrsim \min\{|z-y|, |z-x'|\} \gtrsim \min\{|z-y|, \ell(Q)\} \gtrsim \min\{|z-y|, |z-x|\}.$$

(2) If $y \notin \Omega$, then $y \in \lambda R$ for some $R \in \mathscr{C}_E|^+$. By the previous cases we may assume $|x-y| \geq \varepsilon\ell(R)$, and the proof of this case is similar to the previous one, but now we also find a corkscrew ball near y centered at a point y' and connect paths from x to x', x' to y', and y' to y. We omit the details.

□

Lemma 7.4. *If Ω is C-NTA, then* $\operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega_E^+ \sim_{C,K,\lambda} \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega$.

Proof. By Lemma 7.1, Ω_E^+ has exterior corkscrews, and by Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 7.3, Ω_E^+ has interior corkscrews. If $\operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega < \infty$, we may find $B \subseteq \Omega$ so that $\operatorname{diam} B \sim_C \operatorname{diam}\Omega$. Then $B \subseteq \Omega_E^+$ as well. Let $B' \supseteq B$ be such that $B' \subseteq \Omega_E^+$ and there is $\xi \in \partial B' \cap \partial\Omega_E^+$. Since Ω_E^+ has the exterior corkscrew condition, we may find $B'' \subseteq B(\xi, \operatorname{diam} B')\backslash\Omega_E^+$ with $\operatorname{diam} B'' \sim_{C^+} \operatorname{diam} B' \geq \operatorname{diam} B \sim \operatorname{diam}\partial\Omega$. By looking where the convex hull of B'' and B' intersects $\partial\Omega_E^+$, this implies $\operatorname{diam} d\Omega_E^+ \gtrsim \operatorname{diam} B' \gtrsim \operatorname{diam} d\Omega$. This and Lemma 7.1 finish the proof. □

7.2. **Proof of Lemma 3.2.**

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $\Delta_0 \in \mathscr{D}_0$. We follow the proof in [10]. Let $t \in (0,1)$ and

$$E = \{\xi \in \Delta_0 : \operatorname{dist}(\xi, \Sigma\backslash\Delta_0) < t\ell(\Delta_0)\}.$$

We can assume $E \neq \emptyset$. Let N be the largest integer for which $5c_0^{N+1} > 2t\ell(\Delta_0)$. For $\xi \in E$, there is $\xi' \in \Sigma\backslash\Delta_0$ such that $|\xi - \xi'| < 2t\ell(\Delta_0)$. For every $n \geq 0$ there is $\Delta_n \in \mathscr{D}_n$ such that $\xi' \in \Delta_n$.

Claim: The cubes Δ_{n+1} and Δ_n always have distinct centers for $n = 0, ..., N$. Since $\xi' \notin \Delta_0$, $\Delta_n \not\subseteq \Delta_0$, then $\Delta_n \subseteq \Delta_0^c$ and since $c_1 B_{\Delta_{n+1}} \subseteq \Delta_{n+1}$ and $\xi \in \Delta_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\zeta_{\Delta_n} - \zeta_{\Delta_{n+1}}| &\geq |\zeta_{\Delta_n} - \xi| - |\xi - \xi'| - |\xi' - \zeta_{\Delta_{n+1}}| \\
&\geq c_1\ell(\Delta_n) - 2t\ell(\Delta_0) - \ell(\Delta_{n+1}) \\
&> c_1\ell(\Delta_n) - 5c_0^{N+1} - c_0\ell(\Delta_n) \\
&\geq c_1\ell(\Delta_n) - 2\ell(\Delta_{n+1}) = (c_1 - 2c_0)\ell(\Delta_n) > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.

For $n \leq N$, the center of Δ_n is also the center of a cube $\Delta'_{n+1} \in \mathscr{D}_{n+1}$, and that cube thus must be disjoint from Δ_{n+1}. Moreover, it contains $c_1 B_{\Delta'_{n+1}} = c_0 c_1 B_{\Delta_n}$, and so we have

$$\Delta_{n+1} \cap c_0 c_1 B_{\Delta_n} = \emptyset. \tag{7.1}$$

Let

$$\tilde{\mathscr{D}}_n = \{\Delta \in \mathscr{D}_n : \xi' \in \Delta \text{ for some } \xi \in E\}.$$

If $\Delta \in \tilde{\mathscr{D}}_n$ and $n \leq N$, then

$$|\zeta_\Delta - \xi| \leq |\zeta_\Delta - \xi'| + |\xi' - \xi| < \ell(\Delta) + 2\tau\ell(\Delta_0) < 2\ell(\Delta)$$

so that

$$E \subseteq \bigcup_{\Delta \in \tilde{\mathscr{D}}_n} 2B_\Delta \text{ for all } n < N.$$

Moreover, by (7.1), the family $\tilde{\mathscr{D}} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{N-1}\{c_0 c_1 B_\Delta : \Delta \in \tilde{\mathscr{D}}_n\}$ form a disjoint family of balls. Finally, all cubes in $\tilde{\mathscr{D}}$ are of diameters no more

than $2\ell(\Delta_0)$ and are distance at most $2t\ell(\Delta_0)$ from $\ell(\Delta_0)$, so in particular they are all contained in $4B_{\Delta_0}$ since $t<1$. All these facts imply

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(E) &\leq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\sum_{\Delta\in\tilde{\mathscr{D}}_n}\mu(2B_\Delta) \lesssim_{\mu,c_0,c_1} \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\sum_{\Delta\in\tilde{\mathscr{D}}_n}\mu(c_0c_1B_\Delta)\\ &= \frac{1}{N}\mu\left(\bigcup_{\Delta\in\tilde{\mathscr{D}}} c_0c_1B_\Delta\right) \leq \frac{\mu(4B_{\Delta_0})}{N} \lesssim_{\mu,c_1} \frac{\mu(\Delta_0)}{N}.\end{aligned}$$

By our definition of N, this implies that $\mu(E)\lesssim_{\mu,c_0,c_1}(\log\frac{1}{t})^{-1}$. In particular, this also holds if we replace Δ_0 with any cube $\Delta\subseteq\Delta_0$. Thus, there is $t_1>0$ so that for any $\Delta\subseteq\Delta_0$,

$$\mu(\{\xi\in\Delta:\operatorname{dist}(\xi,\Sigma\backslash\Delta)<t_1\ell(\Delta)\})<\mu(\Delta)/2. \tag{7.2}$$

If $n\in\mathbb{N}$ is so that $5c_0^n<t_1/4\leq 5c_0^{n-1}$ and $\Delta_j\in\mathscr{D}_n$ are such that

$$\Delta_j\cap\{\xi\in\Delta_0:\operatorname{dist}(\xi,\Sigma\backslash\Delta_0)<t_1/2\}\neq\emptyset$$

then for each such j, since $\operatorname{diam}\Delta_j\leq\operatorname{diam}B_{\Delta_j}=10c_0^n<t_1/2$,

$$\Delta_j\subseteq\{\xi\in\Delta_0:\operatorname{dist}(\xi,\Sigma\backslash\Delta_0)<t_1\}. \tag{7.3}$$

Suppose we have shown for some $m\geq 1$ that for any $\Delta\subseteq\Delta_0$

$$\mu(\{\xi\in\Delta:\operatorname{dist}(\xi,\Sigma\backslash\Delta)<c_0^{n(m-1)}t_1\ell(\Delta)/2\})<2^{-m}. \tag{7.4}$$

(Note that the $m=1$ case follows from (7.2).) Then, recalling that $\Delta_0\in\mathscr{D}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu(\{\xi\in\Delta_0:\operatorname{dist}(\xi,\Sigma\backslash\Delta_0)<c_0^{mn}t_1\ell(\Delta_0)/2\})\\ &\quad\leq\sum_j\mu(\{\xi\in\Delta_j:\operatorname{dist}(\xi,\Sigma\backslash\Delta_j)<c_0^{n(m-1)}t_1\ell(\Delta_j)/2\})\\ &\quad\overset{(7.4)}{<}2^{-m}\sum_j\mu(\Delta_j)\overset{(7.3)}{\leq}2^{-m}\mu(\{\xi\in\Delta_0:\operatorname{dist}(\xi,\Sigma\backslash\Delta_0)<t_1\ell(\Delta_0)\}\\ &\quad\overset{(7.2)}{<}2^{-m-1}\mu(\Delta_0).\end{aligned}$$

By induction, (7.4) holds for all $m\geq 1$, which finishes the proof.

□

REFERENCES

1. M. Akman, M. Badger, S. Hofmann, and J. M. Martell. *Rectifiability and elliptic measures on* 1*-sided NTA domains with Ahlfors-David regular boundaries*. Preprint 2015. arXiv:1507.02039.
2. J. Azzam, S. Hofmann, J.M. Martell, K. Nyström, and T. Toro, *A new characterization of chord-arc domains*, to appear in J. Eur. Math. Soc..

3. ———, *A characterization of* 1*-rectifiable doubling measures with connected supports*, to appear in Analysis and PDE (2015).
4. J. Azzam, M. Mourgoglou, and X. Tolsa. *Singular sets for harmonic measure on locally flat domains with locally finite surface measure*. Preprint 2015. arXiv:1501.07585.
5. J. Azzam, S. Hofmann, J.M Martell, S. Mayboroda, M. Mourgoglou, X. Tolsa, and A. Volberg, *Rectifiability of harmonic measure*, submitted.
6. J. Azzam and R. Schul, *Hard Sard: Quantitative Implicit Function and Extension Theorems for Lipschitz Maps*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **22** (2012), no. 5, 1062–1123. MR 2989430
7. M. Badger, *Null sets of harmonic measure on NTA domains: Lipschitz approximation revisited*, Math. Z. **270** (2012), no. 1-2, 241–262. MR 2875832 (2012k:31008)
8. B. Bennewitz and J. L. Lewis, *On weak reverse Hölder inequalities for nondoubling harmonic measures*, Complex Var. Theory Appl. **49** (2004), no. 7-9, 571–582. MR 2088048 (2005f:31005)
9. C. J. Bishop and P. W. Jones, *Harmonic measure and arclength*, Ann. of Math. (2) **132** (1990), no. 3, 511–547. MR 1078268 (92c:30026)
10. M. Christ, *A $T(b)$ theorem with remarks on analytic capacity and the Cauchy integral*, Colloq. Math. **60/61** (1990), no. 2, 601–628. MR 1096400 (92k:42020)
11. B. E. J. Dahlberg, *Estimates of harmonic measure*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **65** (1977), no. 3, 275–288. MR 0466593 (57 #6470)
12. G. David, *Morceaux de graphes lipschitziens et intégrales singulières sur une surface*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **4** (1988), no. 1, 73–114. MR 1009120 (90h:42026)
13. G. David and D. Jerison, *Lipschitz approximation to hypersurfaces, harmonic measure, and singular integrals*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **39** (1990), no. 3, 831–845. MR 1078740 (92b:42021)
14. G. David and S. W. Semmes, *Singular integrals and rectifiable sets in $\mathbf{R}^n$: Beyond Lipschitz graphs*, Astérisque (1991), no. 193, 152. MR 1113517 (92j:42016)
15. ———, *Analysis of and on uniformly rectifiable sets*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 38, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993. MR 1251061 (94i:28003)
16. D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001, Reprint of the 1998 edition. MR 1814364 (2001k:35004)
17. L. L. Helms, *Potential theory*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2009. MR 2526019 (2011a:31001)
18. S. Hofmann and J.M. Martell, *Uniform rectifiability and harmonic measure i: Uniform rectifiability implies poisson kernels in l^p*, Ann. Sci. cole Norm. Sup. 47 (2014), no. 3, 577-654.
19. S. Hofmann, P. Le, J.M. Martell, and K. Nyström, *The weak-A_∞ property of harmonic and p-harmonic measures implies uniform rectifiability*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.09270 (2015).
20. T. Hytönen and H. Martikainen, *Non-homogeneous Tb theorem and random dyadic cubes on metric measure spaces*, J. Geom. Anal. **22** (2012), no. 4, 1071–1107. MR 2965363
21. D. S. Jerison and C. E. Kenig, *Boundary behavior of harmonic functions in nontangentially accessible domains*, Adv. in Math. **46** (1982), no. 1, 80–147. MR 676988 (84d:31005b)

22. R. Kaufman and J-M. Wu, *Distortion of the boundary under conformal mapping*, Michigan Math. J. **29** (1982), no. 3, 267–280. MR 674280 (84b:31003)
23. J. L. Lewis, G. C. Verchota, and A. L. Vogel, *Wolff snowflakes*, Pacific J. Math. **218** (2005), no. 1, 139–166. MR 2224593 (2006m:31005)
24. P. Mattila, *Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 44, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995, Fractals and rectifiability. MR 1333890 (96h:28006)
25. M. Mourgoglou, *Uniform domains with rectifiable boundaries and harmonic measure.* Preprint 2015. arXiv:1505.06167.
26. M. Mourglgou and X. Tolsa, *Harmonic measure and Riesz transform in uniform and general domains*. Preprint 2015. arXiv:1509.08386
27. B. Øksendal, *Sets of harmonic measure zero*, Aspects of contemporary complex analysis (Proc. NATO Adv. Study Inst., Univ. Durham, Durham, 1979), Academic Press, London-New York, 1980, pp. 469–473. MR 623491 (82k:30028)
28. ———, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 43, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993, With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III. MR 1232192 (95c:42002)
29. T. H. Wolff, *Counterexamples with harmonic gradients in* $\mathbf{R}^3$, Essays on Fourier analysis in honor of Elias M. Stein (Princeton, NJ, 1991), Princeton Math. Ser., vol. 42, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1995, pp. 321–384. MR 1315554 (95m:31010)
30. J-M. Wu, *On singularity of harmonic measure in space*, Pacific J. Math. **121** (1986), no. 2, 485–496. MR 819202 (87e:31009)

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES, UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA, EDIFICI C FACULTAT DE CIÈNCIES, 08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA)

E-mail address: jazzam "at" mat.uab.cat